

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 21, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Rev. Gladstone L. Brown, Chagrin Falls Methodist Church, Chagrin Falls, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, the Lord of all who serve, we thank Thee for those who serve in these Chambers. Guide them who have been called to assume great responsibilities—responsibilities no man should assume alone. Walk down the corridors of our lives and speak to us of courage and vision. Save us from pettiness in a day that demands greatness, from smallness of spirit in a world that cries for deep and loving concern. We do not pray for the easy life, but for grace and strength equal to our tasks. Bless our country to responsible freedom and our world to a new hope. Enlarge our minds, inspire our spirits, and be the constant companion of our days. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 273. Joint resolution to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to the lease and transfer of tobacco acreage allotments.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7123. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4 OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS TO SIT TODAY AND TOMORROW DURING GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 4 of the House Select Committee on Small Business be granted permission to sit today and tomorrow during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

ACTION OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE ON REPORT ON ADAM CLAYTON POWELL

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, last week about 150 Members of the House attached their signatures to a letter to the Attorney General of the United States having to do with alleged violations of the Federal statutes by Adam Clayton Powell. I have this morning received a letter from the Department of Justice dated March 20, 1967, signed by Fred M. Vinson, Jr., Assistant Attorney General, which I think should be read to the House in order that they may have knowledge of its contents. It says:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, March 20, 1967.

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The Attorney General has asked me to respond to the letter of March 14, 1967, signed by you and a number of other Representatives, concerning the report of the Select Committee of the House of Representatives appointed to investigate the qualifications and activities of Adam Clayton Powell.

As I advised you in my letter of March 16, the results of the two investigations conducted in the House of Representatives concerned with the alleged misuse of public funds by Mr. Powell are under active consideration. You and your colleagues should be assured that the Department will give this matter thorough and expeditious attention and will take whatever action is deemed appropriate.

I would appreciate your conveying this response to the Representatives who with you signed the March 14 letter.

Sincerely,

FRED M. VINSON, JR.,
Assistant Attorney General.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, under the Cultural Exchange Act, foreign exchange students studying in this country are not required to pay social security taxes on their earnings. This is because they are required after their study course is completed to return to their native countries and apply the skills they have acquired in behalf of their fellow countrymen. Thereafter, they remain ineligible for immigration to the United States for a period of 2 years. The rationale was that they should not be required to pay taxes into a program from which they would likely never be able to draw benefits.

The same privilege was not extended to railroad retirement taxes. Exchange students whose earnings are derived from railroad employment are required to pay the taxes even though they have little hope of acquiring benefit entitlement. Entitlement under the Railroad Retirement Act requires a minimum of 10 years' service.

This difference in tax treatment has worked an unexpected hardship in a unique situation. Some railroads own and operate hospitals for the benefit of their employees. Workers in such hospitals are subject to the Railroad Retirement Act. When a foreign exchange doctor accepts assignment to one of these hospitals, he is required to pay railroad retirement taxes.

Under such circumstances, it is becoming increasingly difficult for railroad hospitals to attract exchange doctors. Understandably, they prefer hospitals covered by the social security program, where they are spared the burden of retirement tax deductions from their modest salaries.

I have introduced a bill to eliminate this discriminatory tax treatment, and I respectfully request the Committee on Ways and Means to consider the measure as soon as its heavy workload will conveniently permit.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON THE REFORM OF FEDERAL CRIMINAL LAWS

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend the President announced the appointment of three members of the National Commission on the Reform of Federal Criminal Laws allocated to the executive branch of the Government.

They are Hon. Pat Brown, of California, whom the President named as Chairman of the Commission, Mr. Donald S. Thomas, of Austin, Tex., and Mr. Theodore Voorhees, of Philadelphia, Pa.

The 1-minute time available in the Legislative Calendar today will not permit me to pay appropriate tribute to these three gentlemen. Suffice it to say that each and all of them will bring great talent and experience to bear upon the task which is ours. Now that the membership of the Commission has been fully constituted, I express the hope that the President will see fit to expedite the supplemental appropriation necessary to finance preliminary organization work. Already, nearly 5 months of the life of the Commission has expired, and because the mandate of the Commission is so broad and so deep, it is vitally important to begin as promptly as possible.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION—PERMISSION TO SIT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Accounts of the Committee on House Administration may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

TRUMAN SUPPORTS THE PRESIDENT AT THE GUAM CONFERENCE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my

remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, once again the Nation owes a debt of gratitude to our beloved former President Harry S. Truman. Yesterday, President Truman issued a statement of support for President Johnson and the administration's Vietnam policies. This statement bears the Truman trademark: It clears the air with straight talk and common-sense.

President Truman observed that three Presidents have taken a stand against aggression in Vietnam.

We have done this—

He said—

because there was a threat to the liberties of all mankind, including our own.

He reminded us that southeast Asia "has become a critical testing ground of our will to support the cause of freedom, as well as the cause of peace."

And he added:

We cannot afford now to falter or to throw away the gains so dearly won.

I believe the American people support this view. I believe they join in applauding President Truman's observation:

Lyndon Johnson has met these problems with wisdom and courage and much patience.

President Truman knows firsthand the courage it takes to stand up to aggression. He knows the problems and difficulties facing a President who commits American forces to the defense of freedom.

But, like President Johnson, he also knows that there can be no security for any nation if aggression is allowed to go unchecked, or if the strong are allowed to overrun the weak.

As President Truman said: The American people should give President Johnson their full support to bring us to a successful conclusion to this struggle.

Our hopes and prayers are with him—

Mr. Truman said. I think the American people and the U.S. Congress will gladly add: "Amen."

MAKING SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1967, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 7123) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes," with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

On page 2, line 14, strike out all after "\$403,700,000" down to and including "1967" in line 19.

On page 3, line 6, strike out all after "Provided," down to and including "1967" in line

11 and insert: "That not less than twenty-five National Guard airlift groups shall be maintained during fiscal year 1968".

On page 4, line 3, strike out all after "Provided," down to and including "1967" in line 8 and insert: "That not less than forty Air Force Reserve troop carrier and airlift groups shall be maintained during fiscal year 1968".

One page 4, line 11, strike out all after "\$85,800,000" down to and including "1967" in line 16.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations explain to us just what the amendments by the other body propose to do?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from California yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from California [Mr. Lipscomb] knows this House passed the supplemental Defense appropriation bill for the support of southeast Asia operations in the sum of \$12,196,520,000 on March 16, last Thursday. It was passed by the other body yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, the other body has not changed any of the figures, and the bill, from the standpoint of dollars is the same as it was when passed by the House.

However, Mr. Speaker, the House had adopted a provision which provided that no funds could be used to reduce or plan the reduction of the troop carrier and airlift units of the Air National Guard and the Air Force Reserves.

Mr. Speaker, the other body struck out the House language and, with respect to the Air National Guard, added language, as follows:

That not less than twenty-five National Guard airlift groups shall be maintained during fiscal year 1968.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Air Force Reserve units this language was added by the other body:

That not less than forty Air Force Reserve troop carrier and airlift groups shall be maintained during fiscal year 1968.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this language provides for the continuation of the present number of airlift and troop carrier groups for the Reserve components of the Department of the Air Force.

We have taken the position that this is no time to reduce the troop carrier or airlift strength available to the Department of Defense.

I have not asked that the bill go to conference for the purpose of improving the language added by the other body. For myself, I must say that the language leaves much to be desired. I would like to see it modified but there is a need for speed in getting this legislation to the President as it relates to funds urgently needed for the war effort and delay must be avoided.

The whole question of airlift and tactical troop carrier strength will be before us again in connection with the Defense appropriation bill for the forthcoming fiscal year. At the same time Congress

can work its will with respect to the issues involved.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this generally covers the changes that were made.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments on the matter. I believe the language proposed by the other body is a good solution to the problem.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 42]

Ashley	Flynt	Mathias, Md.
Battin	Foley	O'Hara, Mich.
Boiling	Ford,	Passman
Bow	William D.	Pool
Brock	Gibbons	Rees
Broomfield	Griffiths	Resnick
Broyhill, N.C.	Hanna	Ronan
Cahill	Hébert	Rostenkowski
Conyers	Herlong	Tuck
Cunningham	Hungate	Vander Jagt
Dawson	Jacobs	White
Dent	Leggett	Widnall
Diggs	McEwen	Williams, Miss.
Feighan	Martin	Willis

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 392 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON RULES—PERMISSION TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcalls Nos. 40 and 41 I am recorded as being absent and not voting. I was detained and could not get here in time to vote on these measures. If I had been present, I would have voted "yea" on each of those rollcalls.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the call of the Private Calendar. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

MICHAEL P. BUCKLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1562) for the relief of Michael P. Buckley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1562

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Michael P. Buckley, of Pittsfield, Massachusetts, is hereby relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of \$389.50, the amount of the balance, as of August 11, 1964, of his liability to the United States on General Accounting Office Claim Number Z-2250627. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for any amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRYCE A. SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1574) for the relief of Bryce A. Smith.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

CECIL A. RHODES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1526) for the relief of Cecil A. Rhodes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1526

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the employment of Cecil A. Rhodes of Jacksonville, Florida, in a civilian position by the Post Office Department during periods of service on active duty with the United States Navy beginning on March 27, 1960, and ending October 4, 1965, shall be deemed lawful, and he shall be entitled to all of the compensation and other benefits to which he would have been entitled had he not been serving on active duty during such period.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN T. KNIGHT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1528) conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of John T. Knight.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

MR. AND MRS. HOWARD H. ADELBERGER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1536) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Howard H. Adelberger.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

N. M. BENTLEY AND GEORGE MARKWALTER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1586) granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to render judgment on certain claims of N. M. Bentley against the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1586

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any statute of limitations or administrative determination, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment for any amount found to be legally or equitably due upon the claims of N. M. Bentley and George Markwalter, jointly, who compose a copartnership under the name and style of N. M. Bentley of Macon, Georgia, against the United States for losses, if any, incurred in the performance of contract numbered AF-09 (603)—25991 with the United States of America (Robins Air Force Base, Georgia). Such suit shall be instituted within six months after the date of the enactment of this Act; *Provided,* That the procedure for the determination of such claims, and review thereof, and payment thereon shall be the same as in the case of claims over which the Court of Claims has jurisdiction as now provided by law.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RICHARD L. BASS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1587) for the relief of Richard L. Bass.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1587

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Richard L. Bass, of Forsyth, Georgia, is relieved of liability to pay to the United States the sum of \$353.05, representing the amount of salary overpayment received by him from the Department of the Air Force from October 26, 1962, through June 8, 1965, due to administrative error and without fault on his part. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount of which liability is relieved by the section.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Richard L. Bass, of Forsyth, Georgia, the sum certified by him to the Secretary of the Air Force as the

aggregate of amounts paid to the United States by Richard L. Bass and amounts withheld by the United States from sums otherwise due him from the United States, on account of the liability referred to in the first section of this Act. No part of the amount appropriated in this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of the preceding sentence shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, lines 6 and 7, strike "October 26, 1962, through June 8, 1965" and insert "October 7, 1962, through June 5, 1965".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. A. E. HOUSLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1646) for the relief of Mrs. A. E. Housley.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

MRS. ROSE THOMAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1785) for the relief of Mrs. Rose Thomas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1785

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$7,921.20 to Mrs. Rose Thomas of Los Angeles, California, in full settlement of her claims against the United States for the losses and damages suffered by her late husband, David Thomas, as the result of an inequitable court-martial on November 11, 1901, while a member of the Twenty-third Company, Coast Artillery, Santa Clara Battery, United States Army, which resulted in an unjustified dishonorable discharge which was corrected on January 29, 1954, by an honorable discharge stating that the said David Thomas was honorably discharged from the Army of the United States on December 26, 1901. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, lines 5 and 6: Strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GERALD LEVINE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1880) for the relief of Gerald Levine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ROBERT A. HARWELL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1945) for the relief of Robert A. Harwell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1945

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$25,000 to Robert A. Harwell in full settlement of his claims against the United States to compensate him for the amount equitably due for approximately sixty acres of land in Haskell County, Oklahoma, and described as that part of the east half of the northwest quarter lying north of Oklahoma State Highway Numbered 9, in section 24, township 9 north, range 18 east of the Indian base and meridian, Haskell County, State of Oklahoma. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARLINE AND MAURICE LOADER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1971) for the relief of Arline and Maurice Loader.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

WILLIAM JOHN MASTERTON, GEORGE SAMUEL KONIK, AND LOUIS VINCENT NANNE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2048) for the relief of William John Master-

ton, George Samuel Konik, and Louis Vincent Nanne.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ELMER O. ERICKSON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2207) for the relief of Elmer O. Erickson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2207

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in the administration of the laws, rules, and regulations pertaining to the seniority rights of employees of the Post Office Department, Elmer O. Erickson, of Minneapolis, Minnesota, an employee of the postal service formerly assigned to the Saint Paul and Aberdeen railway post office, Minnesota, shall be entitled to receive credit for service performed by him in the postal service during the period from August 12, 1940, through January 13, 1961, in like manner as if the provisions of sections 748.1 through 748.17 of the Postal Transportation Service seniority rules, Post Office Department Publication 31, dated August 18, 1958, under which certain employees who transfer from and later reenter an occupational group subject to such rules will have service seniority based upon the seniority they had attained before transferring from such group, had been applicable with respect to the said Elmer O. Erickson during the period from January 14, 1961, the date he transferred from the clerical group, which is the occupational group into which he and other former employees of the Postal Transportation Service were placed when such Service was merged into the post offices, to April 29, 1961, the date he retransferred to such group, the said Elmer O. Erickson not having been advised prior to his transfer from such group that the Postal Transportation Service seniority rules had been terminated.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NORA AUSTIN HENDRICKSON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2434) for the relief of Nora Austin Hendrickson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2434

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3010 of title 38, United States Code, or any statute of limitations, the benefits payable to Nora Austin Hendrickson under the veterans' benefits provisions of title 38 of the United States Code as the surviving widow of the late Edward Harold Hendrickson, who died September 20, 1962, shall be paid, effective from the first day of September 1962.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike "benefits payable to" and insert "application filed by".

Page 1, line 8, strike "September 20, 1962" and insert "September 30, 1962".

Page 1, line 9, strike "be paid, effective from the first day of September 1962." and insert "be held and considered to have been filed with the Veterans' Administration within one year after his death and shall be considered in accordance with the law applicable as of that date."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEAN P. BARTELT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2455) for the relief of Dean P. Bartelt.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2455

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Dean P. Bartelt, of Madison, Wisconsin, is hereby relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of \$102.36, representing an overpayment of travel allowance paid to him by the United States Army through administrative error. In the audit and settlement of the account of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this Act.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Dean P. Bartelt an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section.

Sec. 3. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORBIE F. COCHRAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2652) for the relief of Corbie F. Cochran.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2652

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding section 1310 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, as amended (5 U.S.C. 43, 1964 ed., footnote), the advancement in grade of Corbie F. Cochran, an employee of the Department of the Army, Fort Eustis, Virginia, from GS-6 to GS-9, effective April 29, 1964, shall be deemed to have been in conformity with law, such advancement, in contravention of said section 1310, having been made as a result of administrative error without fault or knowledge of its illegality on the employee's part.

Sec. 2. (a) That the said Corbie F. Cochran is relieved of any liability to the United States arising out of the advancement de-

scribed in section 1 of this Act. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this subsection.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Corbie F. Cochran, an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him or withheld from amounts otherwise due him in partial liquidation of his liability to the United States referred to in subsection (a) of this section.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 13, after "section.", add the following:

"No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceed \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF NURSING

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2653) for the relief of the American Journal of Nursing.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2653

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to settle and adjust the claim of the American Journal of Nursing, New York, New York, for an advertisement placed in its August 1966 issue of the American Journal of Nursing by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and to allow in full and final settlement of such claim the sum of \$238.50. Such amount shall be payable from the appropriation "Hospitals and medical care, Public Health Service, 1967."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 11, strike "Helath" and insert "Health".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

E. F. FORT ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2661) for the relief of E. F. Fort, Cora Lee Fort Corbett, and W. R. Fort.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

CKIII—468—Part 6

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ARLEY L. BEEM

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2756) for the relief of Arley L. Beem, aviation electrician's mate chief, U.S. Navy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2756

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$614.62 to Arley L. Beem, aviation electrician's mate chief, United States Navy (service number 6339195), in settlement of his claim against the United States for reimbursement for medical expenses incurred by him in February 1964 on behalf of his dependent mother as a result of administrative error on the part of naval personnel. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 11, strike "in".

Page 2, line 1, strike "excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CWO BERNHARD VOLLMER, U.S. NAVY (RETIRED)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2762) for the relief of CWO Bernhard Vollmer, U.S. Navy (retired).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2762

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the limitations of the Act of October 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 1061; 31 U.S.C. 71a) or any other statute of limitations, the claim of Chief Warrant Officer Bernhard Vollmer, United States Navy (retired), for retired pay for the period of November 1, 1946, through July 31, 1948, inclusive, alleged to have been erroneously withheld from him due to his employment by the Fire Department of the Government of the District of Columbia, filed within one year of the effective date of this Act, shall be received, considered, settled, and paid in accordance with the provisions of otherwise applicable law.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM J. HURLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3222) for the relief of William J. Hurley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3222

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That William J. Hurley of Los Altos, California, is hereby relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of \$602.58 representing an overpayment of compensation as an employee of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in the period from July 21, 1964, through July 31, 1965, inclusive, which resulted from retroactive adjustment in his salary by reason of a change in the law made by Public Law 88-426.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to said William J. Hurley, the sum of any amounts repaid or withheld from him by reason of the liability referred to in section 1 of this Act. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRY LEROY JONES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3403) for the relief of Harry LeRoy Jones.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

CHARLES J. ARNOLD

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3715) for the relief of Charles J. Arnold.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TALCOTT and Mr. GROSS objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EDWARD G. BEAGLE, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3716) for the relief of Edward G. Beagle, Jr.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TALCOTT and Mr. GROSS objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SOLOMON S. LEVADI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3887) conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S.

Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Solomon S. Levadi.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

STANDARD MEAT CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3889) for the relief of the Standard Meat Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3889

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Standard Meat Company, of Fort Worth, Texas, the sum of \$3,679.10 in full settlement of all its claims against the United States for expenses and losses incurred by it as a result of the mislabeling by the Meat Inspection Division of the United States Department of Agriculture of a shipment of meat to Liverpool, England, in 1965. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 11, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUREX CORP.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4445) for the relief of Aurex Corp.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4445

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Aurex Corporation, an Illinois corporation, the sum of \$172,550 in full satisfaction of its claims against the United States for damages and losses suffered as the result of serious errors in excess profits determination incident to contract renegotiation in accordance with the opinion of the United States Court of Claims in the congressional reference case, Aurex Corporation against The United States, numbered 12-58, decided April 15, 1966. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 20 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary not-

withstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY F. THOMAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4566) for the relief of Mary F. Thomas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MRS. WILLIFRED S. SHIRLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4809) for the relief of Mrs. Willifred S. Shirley.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

ROBERT A. OWEN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4930) for the relief of Mr. Robert A. Owen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4930

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Mr. Robert A. Owen, of Springfield, Virginia, is relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of \$4,056.06, representing the total amount of overpayments of compensation paid to him by the United States Navy as the result of an administrative error in determining the amount of service that should be credited to him for pay purposes. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Robert A. Owen, referred to in the first section of this Act, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT L. MILLER AND MILDRED M. MILLER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5677) for the relief of Robert L. Miller and Mildred M. Miller.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the Private Calendar be dispensed with at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE ACT OF JUNE 30, 1954, AS AMENDED, PROVIDING FOR THE CONTINUANCE OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 388 to amend the act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 388

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5277) to amend the Act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.R. 5277, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 303), and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 5277 as passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Hawaii is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILL] and, pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The gentleman from Hawaii is recognized.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 388 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5277) to amend the act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill, H.R. 5277, is to provide an increase of \$7.5 million in the amount authorized to be appropriated for the government of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands for the fiscal year 1967 and increases of \$17.5 million for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969, or a total increase of \$42.5 million over the next 3 fiscal years.

The Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands consists of the Caroline and the Marshall Islands and all of the Marianas except Guam. Its total land area is only 687 square miles although it is comprised of 2,100 islands scattered over a 3-million-square-mile area.

Its total population is about 90,000 inhabitants.

The territory is administered by the United States under a trusteeship agreement with the Security Council of the United Nations under authority granted in 1947.

Under that agreement, the United States has "full powers of administration, legislation, and jurisdiction," and is obligated to "foster the development of such political institutions as are suited to the trust territory and promote the development of the inhabitants toward self-government or independence."

Under the bill, H.R. 5277, as amended, the annual appropriation authorization will be increased from \$17.5 million to \$25 million for the fiscal year 1967 and to \$35 million for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969.

Important progress has been made in the administration of the trust territory, but much remains to be done to elicit individual initiative, to attract private investment, and to develop public health and educational facilities and the infrastructure of roads, water supplies, and so forth, without which the local economy cannot readily expand.

The development of basic facilities and services has been greatly complicated by factors such as the geographic dispersion of the inhabited islands, the small land area of the islands, the high birth rate and the large proportion of children in the population, the low level of the islands' economic and social development, and the high cost of transportation to and within Micronesia. Past appropriations have not encouraged development of the full potential of the islands.

Mr. Speaker, whether we like it or not, we are the trustees of the welfare of the people of the trust territory and we are on a testing ground in that area, and we have not been highly praised for the work that we have done there thus far.

The additional money authorized to be appropriated would bolster health, education, water power, and sewage services; provide better air, ground, and water transportation; modernize and extend radio and telephone communica-

tions; and provide suitable buildings for the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the territorial government.

It is felt that a 3-year program in which the most urgently needed projects are given priority in the expenditure of funds is the best means of alleviating the territory's predicament.

By the end of the 3 years, the recently appointed, dedicated, and most competent High Commissioner, Mr. William Norwood, who incidentally is a citizen of my home State of Hawaii, will have had a chance to review the territory's expenditures and its future needs and will be able on the basis of his personal knowledge to review the territory's expenditures and its future needs and will be able to submit such requests for further authorization as he feels are necessary for the territory's development.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 388, in order that H.R. 5277 may be considered.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. The gentleman from Hawaii has provided a lucid, general description of Micronesia. Before we consider this bill, I think a couple of other geographic facts are pertinent and enlightening.

Take any Mercator projection map of the Far East, and with an ordinary school compass draw a circle with the center at the island of Tobi in the trust territory Caroline Islands, and the radius of that circle touching Mill Atoll in the Marshalls, also part of Micronesia. The completed circle will include all or parts of Japan, Korea, the U.S.S.R., Mongolia, Red China, East Pakistan, India, Bhutan, Burma, Laos, Thailand, Vietnam, Cambodia, Malaysia, Indonesia, the Philippines, and Australia.

Another comparison demonstrates that the distance between the district center at Koror, in the Carolines, to Saigon, is shorter than that from Peking to Saigon.

We should be aware of these geographic relationships. Southeastern Asians, you may be sure, are aware, and what we do there is significant, as the gentleman from Hawaii has said.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman give us some idea of where we propose to get this extra \$42 million?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. CAREY. I thank the gentleman. I hope that all these matters will be discussed in general debate, and that at that time we shall be able to go into the matter that the gentleman from Iowa is addressing to the gentleman from the Rules Committee at this time.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUILLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] has stated, House Resolution 388 provides an open rule with 1 hour of debate for the con-

sideration of H.R. 5277, the bill amending the act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Additionally, the rule provides that upon passage of the bill, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is discharged from further consideration of the Senate passed bill, S. 303, and it will be in order, under this rule, to take the bill, S. 303, strike all after the enacting clause, and insert the House-passed language.

The purpose of the bill is to provide an additional authorization for the government of the trust territory for fiscal year 1967, and to increase current authorizations for fiscal years 1968 and 1969.

Under the bill an additional \$7.5 million is authorized for 1967. The bill as printed does not contain an amendment adopted by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs which, first, reduces the fiscal year 1968 authorization from \$42 million to \$35 million; and second, authorizes \$35 million for fiscal year 1969. This makes a total additional authorization of \$35 million for both 1968 and 1969, as \$17.5 million was authorized by the act as amended in 1962. The total cost of the bill as now amended by the committee would be \$42.5 million for fiscal years 1967 to 1969. The amendments were recommended by the Department of Interior.

The committee has also struck out all of section 2 on page 2, lines 8 through 15.

The islands included in the trust territory are all of the Caroline and Marshall Islands and all of the Marianas except Guam. More than 2100 islands, scattered over a 3-million-square-mile area, are included. The total land area is only 687 square miles, with some 90,000 inhabitants. This area is administered by the United States under trusteeship from the United Nations.

The funds authorized by the bill will go to improve health and educational facilities, water power, and sewage disposal, and improve transportation and communication facilities. Some will be used to provide adequate physical facilities for the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the territorial government.

The bill was reported unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution, and I urge that it be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further request for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUILLLEN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Under the rule, particularly page 2, lines 3 and 4, is it the opinion of the gentleman that a separate vote could be demanded on any separate amendment adopted while in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union?

Mr. QUILLLEN. That point was not discussed in the Rules Committee. I would like to yield to the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. HALL. I think the gentleman would agree with me that if it was not mentioned—

Mr. QUILLEN. Certainly it could be asked for.

Mr. HALL. The rules of the House would prevail.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUILLEN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Is it not true that the amendments could be voted on separately?

Mr. QUILLEN. That is possible.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to impose on the time of the House, but there are some problems that have been called to my attention about some of the employees in the trust territory that have created serious problems for me. I have had some members of my district employed by the trust territorial government, and, finding themselves with some problems especially having to do with disability conditions or injuries, they have found they are neither fish nor fowl.

Even though it was represented to them at the time they were employed that they were civil service employees, actually this was not a fact. For the past some 5 or 6 years we have been going through a long period of considering and discussing solicitors' opinions from the Department of Interior on the one hand, and the solicitors from the Department of Labor on the other hand, and those from the General Accounting Office on the third hand, all seemingly in some disagreement as to the actual status of an employee of the trust territory government. I did want to call that to the attention of the House and to the attention of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the hope that some hearings, if possible, might be held, or some study by staff might be made to see if we cannot clarify the exact status so far as benefits that might accrue to employees.

On May 14, 1951, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission in a letter to the Secretary of the Interior stated that American citizens recruited in the United States for work in the trust territory are performing a function for the Government of the United States and are, therefore, employees of the United States subject to the laws affecting U.S. Government personnel.

It appears that the government of the trust territory has taken the position it will follow civil service rules, but that employees are employed by "excepted appointment" without going through the Civil Service Commission, and that this employment does not confer civil service status. They say employees are entitled to "practically all the rights and privileges enjoyed by regular civil service employees."

The Comptroller General has concurred in the view of the Civil Service Commission that such employees—as distinguished from native Micronesians, I might make clear—are employees of the United States. This was a firm decision and ruling by the General Accounting Office that they were employees of the United States.

However, the Bureau of Employees Compensation of the Department of Labor, which administers the Federal Employee Compensation Act, in a series of rulings between 1952 and 1954, which are still adhered to and binding, as we understand, have concluded that this group of employees are not within coverage of the Compensation Act and it does not regard the determination of the Civil Service Commission as controlling in this regard.

In 1965, the trust territory government apparently had 238 employees other than natives, almost all of whom are U.S. citizens recruited from the mainland. In the absence of coverage by the Compensation Act for on-the-job compensable injuries or illnesses, it appears that the trust territory government has entered into a contract with an Australian insurance company to provide equivalent coverage. The trust territory government transmits claims to the company which determines whether or not they should be paid.

It is peculiar, to say the least, that an Australian company should determine the compensation rights of U.S. citizens employed by the U.S. Government.

Our investigation of one such alleged injury discloses that the entire question of jurisdiction, authority and responsibility between the Federal and the trust territory government is vague and uncertain.

The Department of the Interior appears to take the position—I might say, it has been very difficult to pin them down to any position—that the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior is pretty well exhausted by the appointment of the High Commissioner and perhaps some additional key officials, and thereafter the trust territory government is "on its own."

It would appear that the status and rights of U.S. citizens and nationals employed in the trust territory should be definitely established.

It appears further that in order to do an adequate job in carrying out its trust or agency function for the United Nations the U.S. Government should more clearly establish its lines of authority, jurisdiction, and responsibility for the work of its arm in the trust territory and whether or not the government there is actually an independent agent or a section of the Federal Government.

I wish to quote just briefly from a communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior to the Director of the Budget. This was in a letter of May 13, 1965. The Director of the Budget at that time was Kermit Gordon.

He says this, in response to a request:

In a letter from the Civil Service Commission to this Department, dated May 14, 1951, the Commission stated that "American citizens recruited in the United States by the Department of Interior for work in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands are performing a function of the Government of the United States and are therefore, employees of the United States, subject to the laws affecting the U.S. Government personnel."

In the next paragraph he further states, in his letter to the Director of the Budget:

The Comptroller General of the U.S. has explicitly concurred in that such employees of the Trust Territory are employees of the U.S. In a decision concerning the home leave (B-133 696, September 23, 1957) the Comptroller stated in pertinent part "We concur with the view that the employees in question are employees of the U.S. notwithstanding that their compensation in the cost of their travel is in part from mixed funds. As such they are entitled to home leave, travel benefits under—Section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 as amended."

The last thing I should like to call to the attention of the House, further quoting from this memorandum to the Director of the Budget, is this:

However, the Bureau of Employees Compensation, Department of Labor, which administers the Federal Employee Compensation Act has concluded that this group of employees cannot in the view of that Bureau be regarded as within the coverage of the Compensation Act. The Bureau of Employee Compensation has advised us that it does not regard the determination of the Civil Service Commission as controlling the application of the benefits of the Compensation Act.

I have quite a raft of additional material, but I did want to call this to the attention of the House, particularly in the hope that at some future time the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs might, in its deliberations, see fit to consider the status of these people to the extent at least of protecting the rights of American citizens from what I consider to have been some pretty substantial infringements on their rights in recent years by the trust territory government, in the failure to defend the rights of American citizens employed.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I am happy to yield to my good friend from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. May I say, in answer to the desire of the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK], that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will take up this matter for future discussion when the broader picture is before us. We have had the problem before us in a general manner heretofore, but never in any specific way such as the gentleman now brings to the attention of the House.

These matters are involved. The gentleman from California knows the jurisdiction that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has over this territory. I think that we should have a rather full-blown inquiry into what is involved rather than a discussion of it on the floor at this time.

Mr. SISK. I thank my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for his statement, and I certainly support the bill which is before us today. Having spent a month in that area, I well recognize many of the problems involved. I certainly support the things that we can do to improve conditions in that area. Particularly I appreciate the assurance of the chairman that his committee will give full consideration to the subject area.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I want to say that I am

delighted to have the gentleman from California take the time to bring this matter to our attention. I wish to concur with the statement made by the chairman of the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I believe this is a matter that should be investigated by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I shall be happy to cooperate with the chairman in seeing to it that this matter is fully investigated and a conclusion of some sort reached, particularly with regard to employment.

Mr. SISK. I thank my good friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5277) to amend the act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 5277, with Mr. GETTYS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY].

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, in asking for the hour for discussion and debate on this particular piece of legislation, the committee felt that there might be some general questions relative to the trust territory that would be of interest to the Members of the House. It is not likely that we will take the whole hour for debate on this particular bill, but inasmuch as the area does concern an area as large as the United States with the number of people approximating 95,000, and also that there are 2,100 islands, and, further realizing that the land area all put together would be about two-thirds the size of the State of Rhode Island, this does involve some rather peculiar questions as far as administration concerned and, also as far as firming up the program which we feel is now necessary.

Mr. Chairman, this is the first time in 5 years that the Secretary of the Interior and the High Commissioner have asked for an increase in the expenditures in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Our committee agrees with them that the increase is justified but we have

warned the High Commissioner that he will be held to a strict accounting of his expenditures. We are asking him to advise us orally and in writing of the manner in which he is allocating and spending his funds. As we have several times in the past, we will again have a several-member team visit the islands during the fall recess to obtain an on-the-spot look at the projects that will be constructed under this bill.

We are doing this not because we do not trust High Commissioner Norwood, for whom we have the greatest admiration and respect but because we feel it is incumbent on us to know what is going on in this very strategic area in the Pacific.

Mr. Chairman, during the middle fifties the Federal Government spent about \$5 million per year in the trust territory. Then we raised the ceiling on the expenditures to \$7½ million. We were operating on a holding basis at that time. By 1962 we came to realize that we were going to continue operations in the islands for years to come. Therefore we needed permanent construction for schools, hospitals, public works and communications and for economic development.

For fiscal 1962 Congress raised the ceiling of expenditures to \$17½ million—where it remains today.

The members of the committee handling the legislation believe in order to maintain our posture in the Pacific; to construct permanent facilities, and to encourage health, education, and economic conditions, we must spend money. We have amended H.R. 5277 to provide for a \$7½ million increase in funds for the remainder of fiscal 1967 and increased to \$35 million the expenditures for fiscal years 1968 and 1969, but in doing so, we are telling the High Commissioner that he will have to satisfy us that he is justifying the expenditures. I fully realize that fiscal 1967 is nearing its end and it may be difficult to spend that additional \$7½ million between now and June 30. The High Commissioner advised us that he will use those funds for making and firming up contracts that have been held in abeyance pending the enactment of this legislation.

In our report we have appended tables which indicate the regular expenditures for 1967, the supplemental request for 1967 that will be made if this bill is enacted, plus the fiscal 1968 and 1969 proposed expenditures. We also asked that these expenditures be projected for 1970 so we could find out the plans the High Commissioner has 2 and 3 years hence.

Mr. Chairman, there have been some questions raised as to the reasons for raising the authorization for fiscal 1967 by \$7.5 million. May I state, very plainly, that in my opinion it was rather difficult, from the justification that was made, to know just how the Department and the Bureau of Territories were going to spend these additional funds. However, upon having additional hearings and receiving further information from representatives of the trust territory personnel, we felt it was only right that we should make allowance to those in charge, especially the new Commissioner,

that he be able to begin building up toward the overall program which they have in mind and for which we believe and feel they have plenty of justification. This then would provide that he have at his disposal \$7.5 million extra for fiscal 1968, and be able to commit that money, or as much as is feasible and possible toward their recognized goals. If it were not committed, the present legislation provides for the authority for it to remain available until expended.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there have been several agencies of Government which have some jurisdiction, in the trust territory. Thus, it is necessary to go back and pick up the thread so that we know what we are doing presently. At first, Mr. Chairman, the trust territory was under the control of the military. The military still has a great deal of power in the area, because, regardless of what may be said, this is a very meaningful area for us in our national defense picture.

Mr. Chairman, at first the President had complete control but, then, in the early 1950's the control of the territory was given over to the Department of the Interior and, thereby, the jurisdiction came to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, Mr. Chairman, this area is subject to visitation every 2 years by representatives from the United Nations Visiting Mission. It is also subject to a great deal of interest on the part of the State Department.

Our committee has attempted at all times to ask for a proper justification of authority in the expenditure of the moneys involved.

Mr. Chairman, I have nothing but admiration and commendation for those who have served as High Commissioners of this area in the past. It is my opinion that they have done their job well. Perhaps the Congress and the Department of the Interior, have been too niggardly in our treatment of these areas. However, Mr. Chairman, we can authorize and spend too much money. If we are not careful, we can spend too much money in this territory and not secure the aims that we desire.

The people of this part of the Pacific have the right to decide for themselves. There are a number of questions that the future will present to us, but in my opinion it is necessary that we see that they are properly educated—not educated out of their own environment, but educated into the position that they can take their place along with the rest of us if they are to become citizens of the United States later on.

They have the right to see to it that their economy is expanded—not blown up as some would do—but expanded sufficiently to bring them into our private enterprise system. The Micronesians know something about a rather viable economy because the Japanese, regardless of what we may say about their administration provided the people of these islands with more than they have had since the beginning of World War II.

The Micronesians also have the right, in my opinion, to see to it that their health conditions are improved.

With all of these matters in mind, we feel that the Department of the Interior has justified the need for additional funds within the limitations which this legislation provides, and we would ask the House of Representatives to go along with the committee, keeping in mind that this committee always tries to be just as careful in its authorizations of amounts of money to be spent as it possibly can, feeling that it is the duty and the obligation of the committee to do the job before it is brought to the House for debate.

Mr. Chairman, I think I would be perfectly honest in answering my friend from Iowa [Mr. Gross], when he attempted to ask the question during the consideration of the rule that this money must come from the taxpayers of the United States of America. There is no other place it can come from. It will not come back to us in the form of any financial benefits we receive from the islands themselves. It must come from the taxpayers. But undoubtedly these funds might be considered to be the most beneficial that we could possibly spend in that particular area at this time.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will discuss other facets of the bill and explain further the items for which expenditures are sorely needed and highly desirable.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he desires to the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I rise in support of this legislation.

Following World War II, an area from east to west and north to south, larger than the continental United States, which was given the name of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands was turned over to our country to administer under the direction and supervision of the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations. Most of these islands were won from the Japanese during World War II by the American forces, and many Americans gave their lives that this area might be free.

In this area, which is as vast as the continental United States, live approximately 90,000 people with different cultures. There are various chains of islands and the culture varies in each of these chains. The duty of the High Commissioner is not one of laying down a policy which can be applied uniformly throughout the trust territory, but by necessity requires a series of policies so that the various island groups can be properly administered.

The men who have occupied the position of High Commissioner have been dedicated people. Living in the trust territory, contrary to the movies and the novels and the popular belief of life in a tropical island, leaves a great deal to be desired. All of the things you have read about in books and the pictures you have seen in the movies are far from reality, if you will take the time or the trouble to visit these islands.

The effort to assist the Micronesian

people to improve their health and to improve their living conditions, to improve their schools and to give them some sense of government of themselves has been a challenge to the American people. It has been a challenge to the High Commissioner and to the people who have worked for the trust territory.

One of the pressing matters in the trust territory is the matter of health. I know when the survey was made showing the small number of hospital beds that are available that many people questioned the length of stay that some of the patients had because it far exceeded the average hospital time spent by people in the United States or in the countries of Europe. But I want to say to my colleagues, this is explained in two very good ways: First, the diseases by which these people are afflicted are tropical and long suffering diseases and not the same diseases as we find in our country. The doctors in the trust territory have a real challenge to determine what the treatment shall be and what kind of medication and home care shall be given to these men, women, and children.

Second, once hospitalized and since the islands are so far removed from one another, there is no place for a man or woman or a hospital patient to go until the next boat comes in to take him back to his home island. There is no such thing as a motel or a hotel or other place where these people can go. So they must stay in the hospital under our care. These two things, I think, explain the unusual stay in the hospitals. Homes, as we understand them—the very minimal home—are completely unknown to the people in this area. Therefore, one of the challenges facing the High Commissioner is to try to provide homes which will meet the needs of the people and area. I am proud to say, it is because of the experience which our country has had in Samoa where we have experimented with various types of homes for the islands that the High Commissioner and those in charge are now installing in the various islands of the trust territory, homes of this type which are suited to the native use.

The third item which is of extreme importance is the matter of health. Modern health means are completely or were completely unknown in the trust territory. The infant mortality rate was high and the people did not live to an old age. It has been a real challenge to the people who have gone out there as doctors, nurses, and medical attendants in trying to improve the health of the people in this area.

Last but not least, it has been a real challenge to our administrators in the trust territory to convince parents to send children from these isolated islands into a place where they can receive the fundamentals of education. It is, I believe, a tremendous credit to our country that while these islands have been under our jurisdiction there has been a tremendous increase in the educational facilities available to these young people in the islands. This is borne out by the fact that many have gone through their high schools, and the better students have gone on to Hawaii, where they have been taken in, to the University of

Hawaii, and some of them have come over to the United States and gone on to colleges and universities here.

In the eyes of the world, the challenge exists for our Nation. The challenge exists to us as a people so that when the day comes that the people of the trust territory are asked to determine what their future course will be, they must have but one choice and that choice should be on the side of freedom with our country. In the lifetimes of some of the people on these islands they have been under the jurisdiction of the Spanish, the Germans, the Japanese, and now the United States. When the time comes for these people to make a determination of where they will go as a matter of their own security, they must decide that they will come with the United States.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has reduced the amount which the departments have requested by amending this legislation and has asked to have a complete report on the proposed expenditures. In fact, the members of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs are on record as willing to undertake a trip to the trust territory to find out the conditions for themselves. I ask that you support this piece of legislation.

Lest anyone think that a trip to the trust territory is a junket, I invite any Member of the House to let his or her wishes be known to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and we will arrange to take you on one of those trips. When you come back, you will have a difficult time convincing your wife that the person who gets off the plane and greets her is the same person who left, because you will be worn and haggard. You will have suffered some of the ills that you suffer when you travel throughout the Pacific islands.

But to those of us who have made it, it is a rewarding experience. I hope that the House will see fit to support this legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman has not already given it, I would like some kind of breakdown of this expenditure. Is it \$7.5 million or \$7 million this year—let us deal in the round figures—\$7 million this year and \$35 million next year?

Mr. SAYLOR. It is \$7.5 million additional for this fiscal year, and an increase of \$17.5 million in the authorization for 1968 and 1969. This will make it \$35 million a year for the next 2 fiscal years, and \$25 million for this fiscal year.

Mr. GROSS. That is an increase, is it not?

Mr. SAYLOR. It is an increase of \$7.5 million this year and \$17.5 million for each of the next 2 fiscal years.

Mr. GROSS. Are we not spending a lot of money down there otherwise?

Mr. SAYLOR. We are now spending approximately \$17.5 million.

Under the legislation which is now on the books, they are authorized to expend \$17.5 million each year.

Mr. GROSS. Are there no other agencies of the Government spending money there?

Mr. SAYLOR. The only other agency of the Government is the Defense Department.

Mr. GROSS. Is this a substantial contribution to their economy?

Mr. SAYLOR. Wherever there are native people employed, the answer is "Yes." Where there are no native people employed, the answer is "No."

Mr. GROSS. What is the money to be expended for? Is it for all purposes? Is it for schools and roads and all this?

Mr. SAYLOR. This is for schools, this is for roads, this is for houses, this is for communication, and this is for hospitals.

Mr. GROSS. Is it for recreational facilities?

Mr. SAYLOR. There is nothing in this bill for recreational facilities.

Mr. ASPINALL. Will my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, yield to me?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to my colleague, the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. ASPINALL. Would the gentleman's committee care to advise this Committee to what has been happening in the island in the last 2 weeks and a half as the result of the hurricane?

Mr. SAYLOR. I might say to the Members of the Committee that as a result of the hurricane one of the islands has been practically leveled. The people are living with practically no shelter at all. The types of houses that were built there were built with what was left after World War II. They have been blown away, and the people are living out in the open with absolutely no cover at all.

Mr. ASPINALL. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Is it not true that on the island of Palau, there is Koror, which is a big city in the islands, that this city was more than likely leveled completely to the ground by the military forces as the island was taken, and at that time there were present on the island and in the city of Koror buildings which would have withstood such winds as the last hurricane brought to the islands, and now we find everything destroyed?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct. As a result of military action in World War II, the buildings which had been built by the Germans and the Japanese, which were typhoon-proof buildings, were obliterated. It was a matter of military necessity.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, would the United Nations have any interest in this area?

Mr. SAYLOR. They have only the interest of supervising or inspecting. These territories have been turned over to us as trustee, and each year there is a group from the United Nations specifically designated to take an inspection trip to the trust territories. Every 2 years the High Commissioner, together

with representatives from our committee and the corresponding committee on the Senate side, go to the United Nations, make a report of what we are doing in the trust territories.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman said it is every year that we make such a report.

Mr. SAYLOR. It is every 2 years that we go to the United Nations to make a report.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Does the United Nations make any contribution to this territory?

Mr. SAYLOR. No.

Mr. GROSS. Why not?

Mr. SAYLOR. Well, would the gentleman like to see the money go to the United Nations, and then have them distribute it?

Mr. GROSS. No. I would not like to see that. But I would like to see some help from some of the nations we lavish money on. We would like to have help from some of them somewhere along the line.

Mr. SAYLOR. These people must, I believe, as matter of national security be oriented to the United States. This is why I ask the Members of the Committee to help these islands.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to hear that. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman consumed 17 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY].

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is the first opportunity I have had to present a bill to the committee since I assumed the chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I am sure the committee need not be reminded that this committee was chaired by our former colleague, the gentleman from New York, the Honorable Leo O'Brien.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the Interior Committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] for their leadership and cooperation in the expeditious and thorough consideration of the legislation. I also wish to convey my gratitude and appreciation to the members and staff of the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs. In particular, I am indebted to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Maryland, Representative MORTON, who joined me in the sponsorship of the legislation. Mr. MORTON, by reason of his visit to the trust territories, is most knowledgeable in this matter and has been of great service, enlightenment and education in our desire to know more about this distant area under our trusteeship.

Throughout the 3 days of hearings on this legislation, all the members of the subcommittee on both sides, particularly

those new members who began their service in the 90th Congress, have been most helpful in gaining answers and information on which to base judgments that we must now make in the activity of our Government in connection with our trusteeship responsibility.

Our subcommittee demands that if increased authorizations are to be justified that they should be justified by detail and specification to the greatest degree possible in order that as a committee we stand firmly in our responsibility to determine if each individual capital and current expenditure was necessary, practical, feasible, and advisable. Detail which sets forth the planned use of the funds to be covered by this increased authorization is appended to the committee's report and, I believe, should satisfy the House that these expenditures are as carefully programmed as is possible at this time.

Members may well inquire as to why we are now asking for more than the 1-year authorization. The answer is that the logistical problems are most complex. As a practical matter, every nail, every shingle, every piece of lumber not only has to be hauled into the area of the trust territories; it must be conveyed by small craft or light airplane to the point of future construction. Therefore, planning for the erection of classrooms, health units, residences for teachers, as indeed any utility structure, has to be made many months in advance of planned ground-breakings.

If it proves needful that a dirt road be constructed from one point to another on one of the 2,100 islands in the trust territory complex, this must indeed be a long-term undertaking. If the road, or more probably, the path, is to extend 2 miles—a mile this year and a mile in 1968—you might find it half a road to nowhere. The foliage and undergrowth might recapture it before the second half of the road could be finished.

It is, therefore, a matter of planning economically and planning better that causes us to advocate the authorization be extended over the next 2½ years.

Let me hasten, however, to assure my colleagues that this authorization is not being made on a basis of blind faith. This might be called a "Missouri" style authorization as the chairman of our committee [Mr. ASPINALL] has said. Our attitude as a committee to the Commissioner of the trust territories and to the Department of Interior will be a constant "show me" policy of legislative oversight on the visit and field inspection that we plan to make at the end of this session.

As the chairman has said:

Our Subcommittee expects a full and detailed onsite exposition and explanation by the Territory authorities on the use of every dollar of the budgeted funds.

One central consideration I believe argues for the increased authorizations at this time: The development of this vast area is in the national interest. These islands were hard won by American fighting men.

While it is true that we hold them under United Nations trusteeship, this trusteeship is drawn in the wisdom of

what I believe was good statesmanship and has characteristics which are unique among such type agreements running between the United States and the United Nations. This feature is that the trusteeship arrangement cannot be changed by the United Nations because it would be subject to a veto in the Security Council, where we have such veto power. Also in the agreement, just as the United Nations cannot change the agreement without the Security Council, as the other party to the agreement, the United States must concur in any such change before it could be brought before the Security Council. Therefore, we have in fact, an arrangement that could be described as a double veto power.

This means that for the foreseeable future and for all intents and purposes, this area is and will be controlled and in every way legislated and regulated by the United States. We have, therefore, a clear responsibility to do those things which are necessary in the area, not because of any requirement placed upon us by the United Nations but rather because these things are in our own national interest, and the interest of the territory and its people.

The time has now come when classrooms are needed and housing required for the pupils and teachers of the area. A hospital is needed. Better roads and communications are needed for our governing purposes as well as the use of the inhabitants.

I do not seek to persuade the Committee that we are going to turn this area into anything rivaling Peoria or for that matter, Pascagoula. However, it would appear that it is rational to suggest that this area should develop to some degree on a par with the development of the territory of Guam or American Samoa. For this reason, there is planned in the Department of Interior that there should be a gradual buildup of capital improvements, principally in schools, hospitals, and communications that would achieve this purpose.

A proper question might be: When will the United States ever realize any dividends on its investments that we may be called upon to make in terms of some cost-benefit ratio?

My answer would be that the economic potential of this area is still largely undetermined at this time. However, through a contractual arrangement an economic report is now in the hands of the subcommittee, prepared by the Robert Nathan Associates. This report will receive further detailed study.

However, it does indicate that there is a definite economic potential so that over a period of time this area can to some degree stand on its own feet.

We must be certain that when the people of the area become self-sufficient that they fully understand and appreciate that their interests are best served by remaining under American Government.

Plainly speaking, this is why we are making this investment in order that there will never be any question that the territory, whatever may be its potential, must work out its future under the guidance and Government of the United States.

In terms of real estate the entire 687 square miles of this farflung area is indeed of questionable and probably negligible value. In terms of strategic importance, it is probably priceless and inestimable as an outpost in the Pacific perimeter.

I strongly urge the passage of this legislation.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAREY. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. ASPINALL. Just last week, if I remember correctly, one of the missionaries of the Roman Catholic Church who spent his life out there was privileged to give the invocation in the House here, Reverend Father Costigan.

Mr. CAREY. I am very glad that the gentleman from Colorado reminds me of this. The clergyman he speaks about happens to be a very unusual American. Before going to the trust territory, he was a New York City policeman and he decided that the greatest commitment he could make was that of giving his life to the less fortunate. He has spent 20 years of his life in Ponape, trying to teach the people the basic agricultural skills so that they can help themselves in a provident manner.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Let me make clear to the Members of the Committee, Mr. Chairman, that the way this trusteeship is drawn there is totally adequate protection for the investment—and I use the term advisedly—for the investment of the funds of the people of the United States. This is not a cancellable agreement at the will of the United Nations Security Council, because we have a veto there. Also in the agreement as drawn—and there is good statesmanship in it—we have another veto which states as a party to the agreement we have the right to oppose and the first right to suggest any change in the agreement. So we have, in effect, a double veto which protects our interest. The only thing we are not protected against might be described as our own attitude of possible neglect. If we neglect the area and if we do not live up to our responsibility, the day may come and the time will come when the people of the area, given an opportunity to make a decision, may judge our attitude to be as one of indifference or apathy. We will pay dearly for such an attitude if it should exist. In fact, we would then lose all of the time and money and commitment of life that we have already placed in this area. I do not think that would be a wise decision from an economic standpoint nor from a human standpoint or from the standpoint of our national interest at any time. I do not seek to persuade the committee, Mr. Chairman, that through the use of these funds we intend to turn this area into anything rivaling Peoria or, for that matter, Pascagoula. However, it would appear that it is rational to suggest that this area should develop to some degree on a par with the development of our other territories in that area; namely, Guam and American Samoa.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. CAREY. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. Chairman, for this reason, it is planned in the Department of the Interior that there should be a gradual buildup—and I emphasize "gradual buildup"—of roads, hospitals, and so forth, and these will be basic structures for hospitals. There are no circular drives or plantings or landscaping around these hospitals. They are basic structures to serve the seriously ill, the chronically ill, and the injured. Also, Mr. Chairman, the provisions which are made for classrooms are made upon the basis of simple structures. These represent bedrock-type plans and represent things that need to be done in order to keep up with the inroads of nature.

Mr. Chairman, 85 percent to 90 percent of the population needs this assistance. It is my opinion that this represents a very modest amount and it is something in my opinion we should do in order to actually live up to the responsibility of our trust and in order to live up to the obligations which are due the people who depend upon us and who have depended upon us since we wrested this area as a captive area from the Japanese back in 1944.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I asked a question or two a while ago about the projects to be financed through the use of this money, because I am reminded of what happened some years ago with respect to other projects elsewhere in the Pacific.

Mr. Chairman, I went back to my newsletter of January 4, 1956, when at that time I said:

Some years ago, when he was Foreign Aid Director and had more taxpayers' money to toss out than he had places to put it, Averell Harriman built 200 public rest rooms on vacant lots outside the city of Manila while bug-eyed natives stood around making bets with each other as to what use the cozy little structures were to be put.

Their guesses ranged all the way from storage bins for betel nuts to individual smoke-houses for curing the meat of wild boars. So widespread was the confusion, it is reported, that Harriman was compelled to allot an additional appropriation to send technical aid experts from Washington to give the natives instructions and illustrated lectures on the superiority of American rest room methods over antiquated native customs.

In his Washington column, a noted correspondent tells of a recent trip of inspection by the present Foreign Aid Director to Manila. He found that these projects, forced on reluctant Filipinos, were deserted, rotting away and gradually being covered by the wild, lush growth on that far-away Pacific island.

It seems the native population, including the untamed Igorrotes, had no intention of becoming house-broken and took a dim view of the fancy little hutchies as a replacement for the more familiar facilities provided for them by nature in the form of spreading banyan trees along the shore of a sleepy lagoon.

And so what might have become 200 individual monuments, attesting to the greatness of Harriman as a benefactor of the under-privileged, are disappearing into the greedy jaws of the jungle and thus are des-

tinued to serve merely as additional mute evidence of the folly of one more American ambassador of "good will" with a soft heart—and a head to match.—

Now, Mr. Chairman, I hope this Government is not going to engage in any of this kind of business with the more than \$77 million which is proposed to be spent under this bill.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] yield to me at this point?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call to the attention of my colleague, knowing of his desire—and I believe, perhaps, he has already seen the justification that we have in this particular bill for the amounts to be expended—whether or not we could draw it out as to any particular Chick Sales operation that one might have in mind, I do not believe that appealed to us, because we did not go into that particular facet of the matter. But I would say that in my opinion, for the first time, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY], has in the report justification of the expenditure of funds to be authorized if this bill is passed.

Further, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, I do not believe it at all infringes upon the responsibilities of the Committee on Appropriations. I feel we have brought before the House a very sound report.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have some assurance that there will be no boondoggles. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] said that he wanted to keep these islanders oriented toward the United States. I wonder why we are not as interested in keeping the friendly people of Rhodesia and South Africa oriented to the United States?

As I am sure the Members know, we have two or three of our best tracking stations in South Africa, but President Johnson is determined to alienate and destroy the good will and friendship of these people. I refer, of course, to the incredible action of President Johnson in joining with the leeching British in a boycott of Rhodesia—a boycott which, fortunately, South Africa refuses to support, and for its refusal is being made the object of reprehensible pressure. So I am not impressed by the argument that this bill should be accepted for reasons of orientation when Lyndon Johnson has no hesitation in destroying the friendship of others around the world who are vital to our best interests.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, the legislation now before the Committee involves a vast area far distant from the American Continent, but many of us know this area, because we have been there. We remember Yap, Kwajalein, the Marshalls, the Marianas; because we fought there to protect our Nation and to insure the inhabitants of those islands of the opportunity to develop the blessings of democracy.

We took these remote islands from the Japanese during World War II. I was there and many of you were there. After the war we continued to govern them in accordance with international law until July 1947 when they became a United Nations trust territory. Even then our interest did not cease because these islands again became our responsibility under a trust agreement with the United Nations. When our Nation signed this trust agreement, we assumed responsibility for the security of the island inhabitants and for their political, social, and economic development.

Since we have for all intents and purposes complete control over these 2,100 islands, which constitute Micronesia, our administration of the trust responsibilities is critically observed by the penetrating eyes of the world. As one who has attended a United Nations session on the trust territories, I can tell you that our actions do not go unchallenged and our program of progress does not go unchecked. We are committed to the political, social, and economic development of the trust territory. We must keep this commitment in such a way that we know that we are keeping it, that the people of the trust territory know that we are keeping it, and that the United Nations and the world know that we are keeping it.

In areas of the world far less friendly and much less significant strategically, we are spending a great deal of money—hundreds of millions of dollars—for foreign aid. Certainly here—where the commitments are strong, and the people friendly, and the area so important to our security—we should be willing to invest some of our dollars in our own national interest.

In other areas under the American flag, we have done an outstanding job. As a member of the Subcommittee on Territories, I visited American Samoa and Guam. I had a feeling of pride; we have done a good job in those areas. But I have also visited the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, where we face the most difficult tests, and I did not have that feeling.

That is the thrust of the bill authored by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY], and that is the aim of the comparable legislation introduced by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON]. We have made a valiant effort in the trust territory, but the problems are staggering—much remains to be done.

We have made important strides forward in the field of education: 460 elementary classrooms have been built since 1962; five public high schools have been established during that same period; two out-island junior high schools have been constructed; and 180 stateside elementary school teachers and some 270 Peace Corps volunteers have joined in the education effort with the Micronesian teachers.

But much remains to be done.

Too many children are too frequently taught in overcrowded, thatched-roofed, tin shacks.

About half of the teachers do not have even a high school education.

Too many children live hundreds of

miles from the nearest high school—and I understand that applications are three times as numerous as the number of seats available.

We have indeed, made progress in education, but we are still a long way from a universal, free, public school system from the elementary level through high school.

We have made progress in the field of health, also:

There is now a hospital operating in each of the six districts—three of them have been built since 1961.

Two thirds of the people now live within the vicinity of a district hospital or a field unit.

Immunization programs are affording protection against some of the common disease problems.

But here, too, much remains to be done.

As long as a third of the people receive medical attention only when field boats visit or emergency attention is available.

As long as tuberculosis, leprosy, mental health and other serious health problems persist.

Our aim should be to bring health services to standards which would be acceptable in the average American community.

We have not made adequate progress toward the development of a healthy economy. All too often, those who do successfully complete their education have no opportunity to put their talents to work. Transportation has greatly improved in recent years, but infrequent flights do not enhance travel to, or in, the trust territory—an area stretching 2,600 miles east and west and 1,500 miles north and south. Surface transportation causes considerable delay in such a vast area and communications are limited. Hopefully, the report of the consulting firm which has just completed its study in depth will result in some beneficial recommendations for the coordinated development of the Pacific islands.

As has already been explained, Mr. Chairman, that is what this legislation seeks to accomplish. As explained by the authors of the legislation, it authorizes a \$7½ million increase in the appropriation for the current fiscal year and an annual increase of \$17½ million for fiscal years 1968 and 1969 for undertaking, immediately, the needed capital improvements.

I want to emphasize that this legislative program was given very careful scrutiny by the subcommittee under the leadership of our new chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY], and that the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], has advised those administering the programs that some members of the committee will be sent to inspect the progress achieved with the funds and to make a comprehensive, item-by-item analysis and evaluation of the programs proposed for fiscal years 1968 and 1969. Based upon these findings, this entire subject may be reopened for further consideration by Congress to insure that the aims are achieved.

In conclusion, I want to point out again that we have a solid commitment to this vital area of the world. These people are a warm, friendly people who are 100 percent loyal to the United States. Ultimately, probably within a few years, they will decide their own future by their own vote. They could vote for independence. They could vote to become a territory of the United States, similar to Guam. That choice will certainly reflect their confidence in our good will and in our sincerity as evidenced by our own constructive efforts to improve their opportunities. We can be proud of our progress, Mr. Chairman, but we must remember that there is a bigger job yet to be done, and this legislation is needed in order to keep our commitment with the United Nations and to demonstrate our national interest in the people of the trust territory.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time, and I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my colleague with whom I served as a former Ambassador to the United Nations Trusteeship Council, and a former member of our committee, my colleague from New York [Mr. BINGHAM].

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in enthusiastic support of H.R. 5277, and I want to commend those responsible for bringing this important legislation so promptly to the floor of the House, especially the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the able chairman of the subcommittee, and the dedicated gentleman from Maryland.

As a former member of the committee and subcommittee, and as a former U.S. representative on the United Nations Trusteeship Council, I know how important it is that the United States should fully live up to its responsibilities to the Micronesian people. While these responsibilities of course go beyond the fulfillment of material needs, it is essential that adequate funds be provided for the basic needs of these Pacific islanders, for whose welfare the United States voluntarily undertook to be responsible.

Having visited Micronesia in 1961, I am deeply interested in the future of this area, and I hope this bill will be passed by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Space and Aeronautics, a former member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, before the Reorganization Act was passed, it was my privilege to serve on the Committee on Insular Affairs. I was with the first committee of the House of Representatives that visited the trust territory.

Remember that these islands were the stepping stones that cost us so dearly in World War II. I think our colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR], has pointed that out quite well. I need not remind you of some of the action that took place on these islands. After the war the Pacific Islands became oriented toward us. They are people like the friendly people you find in Polynesia

and throughout the Pacific islands and have a great liking for us in the United States of America.

Just this morning in our Committee on Science and Astronautics, we were discussing the SST. The SST will become a reality in a very few years. I can envision for instance on the Island of Saipan where there is one of the most beautiful beaches in the world that extends for nearly 2 miles—I can envision a great resort area for the people of this country. We have never tried to exploit these islands. Unfortunately, their economy such as it was was pointed toward Japan. Japan needed sugar. She needed the fatty oils. Japan needed fish and she needed things that she could get out of those islands. These things, however, were not essential to us. I am afraid we have failed our trust in developing an economy for the islanders. We have a great responsibility in bringing them into the fold of democracy.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5277, a bill to provide for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes.

As a cosponsor of this legislation I want to state at the outset, that we are dealing here with a most important piece of legislation. We, as the Congress of the United States, have a responsibility to explore this proposition in depth, and that is, the development of the infrastructure of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

The purpose of this legislation is to increase the authorized appropriation for the continuance of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands from the present \$17.5 million to \$35 million for fiscal 1968 and 1969, plus \$7½ million for fiscal 1968. These funds will provide for a program of necessary, and I emphasize necessary, capital improvements and public works relating to health and education facilities, utilities, highways, transportation facilities, communications and public buildings.

Mr. Chairman, this bill will increase the total authorization for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands by a total of \$42½ million for fiscal years 1967, 1968, and 1969. I think and feel that it is important to us as a nation that we have a stake in the trust territory. I am perfectly willing in this case to err in retrospect, rather than be overly conservative at this point in time.

In the 89th Congress the administration had requested \$75 million—much more than is authorized in this legislation. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has seen fit to limit and reduce the administration request requiring a planned program of improvements.

Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize our national obligation and more particularly, our responsibility to promote the political, economic, and social development of this area. Pursuant to Public Law 204 of the 80th Congress, the President of the United States approved a trusteeship agreement for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands between the United States and the Security Council of the United Nations.

If we as a nation are to meet those commitments, then we must provide the funds to promote the economic and social well-being of the people of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, through a program of capital improvements and public works. The need to provide these basic facilities and services throughout this strategic area cannot be emphasized too strongly. Initiation of such basic facilities and services will provide the training ground, the technological and educational basis for the development of a labor supply to support a self-sustaining economy.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of progress during the past 20 years of our trusteeship in this area. However, much remains to be done. If it is to be done, it should be done in accordance with a planned program of development. H.R. 5277, in my opinion, does present such a planned program of development and I urge my colleagues to support the passage of this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland, who has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. MORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] 2 minutes.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I also yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much, as well as the gentleman from Maryland. This is legislation of first importance.

I would like to point out the strategic importance of this area, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, from my point of view as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. These islands spread over the western Pacific Ocean, provide the United States a western sea defense in depth. When properly fortified and defended, this area will prevent sudden attack, and a possible new Pearl-Harbor-type attack, on U.S. territory. These islands are part of the island barrier chain off the east coast of Asia, that should never be permitted to be broken by the United States, to protect a free and open Pacific Ocean, one of the major assets of the free world. They are the eastern doorstep to south Asia, the Philippines and Australia. Adverse possession of this sea frontier could isolate these areas from the free world.

We must remember and carefully consider that these trust islands are spread over 3 million square miles in territory and sea area between the Philippine Islands and the Hawaiian Islands. As a World War II Navy lieutenant I served on a U.S. carrier bridge in that area. So I know from experience of these islands. As a matter of fact, I was first elected to Congress from the South Pacific area, and returned to Congress to take my seat in February 1945. I still remember with gratitude and pride my Navy service on the U.S. Carrier CVE-93, the good *Makin Island*, her fine officers and good crew, under Capt. "Fish" Whaley, and our carrier division under distinguished Adm. Cal Durgin.

I remember so well the evening ashore on a small island just before I left the carrier some time in the latter part of January 1945, when our fellows talked

over the South Pacific. One thing these officers unanimously said to me: When you go back to Congress, make sure that no other U.S. generation will have to take these islands all over again. "Island hopping is not too good for the health."

I repeat those statements as good advice here. I hope the United States will hold these islands firmly in the future; and that we will help these fine island people progress.

We in the United States owe progress to these fine people, as the United States undertook that firm obligation when the United States took over the sole trusteeship under the United Nations Security Council. I look forward to the future when these islands will become self-supporting; but we certainly need this legislation today.

The United States is helping, through our foreign aid programs, over 100 countries around the world. We have a special obligation to the people of the Pacific trust islands. Certainly we should help these people as well. These island people deserve to have the help to have a standard of living and well being enjoyed by every U.S. citizen.

May I give the history of these islands? At the time of assumption of the U.S. trusteeship, General MacArthur at that time was stating the policy that the United States should keep alone the occupation of Japan and her various possessions. How farsighted. And how the United States has avoided in the Pacific area divisions and partitions into zones, as Germany was divided, that has ever since caused so much trouble in Europe.

I favored U.S. sole trusteeship of these islands and agreed with General MacArthur thoroughly. I am very pleased that in these islands, and in the U.S. occupation of Japan, President Truman maintained this policy instead of the way divided occupation was instituted in Europe.

It is rewarding to me that this U.S. sole trusteeship was authorized under my resolution—House Joint Resolution 233 in the 80th Congress—which was a joint resolution introduced on July 8, 1947. I felt the United States should act quickly, and urged strongly the strategic importance of these islands and this area, that were being forgotten in the new peace, and so-called return to normalcy in America. I was specially pleased that this U.S. sole trusteeship was authorized under the United Nations Security Council with the right of the United States to fortify and defend. We should not forget that the United States has the power of veto in the Security Council.

On July 11, 1947, the full House Foreign Affairs Committee—of which I had just become a member that year—considered the bill. On that same day, July 11, the bill was reported out of the House Foreign Affairs Committee unanimously. House Joint Resolution 233 passed the House of Representatives unanimously the same day, thanks to approval by the Speaker and the leadership of both parties. So this trusteeship has bipartisan backing. On July 14, the U.S. Senate passed the measure. On July 18, House Joint Resolution 233 was signed by the

President and became law. So, within a period of 10 days, this bill became U.S. law because of its strategic importance and value for U.S. defense. House Joint Resolution 233 is now Public Law 204 of the 80th Congress.

It should be pointed out that this is not a trusteeship under the General Assembly of the United Nations, but is authorized under article 83 of the United Nations Charter under the U.N. Security Council. In fact, it is the only such trusteeship in the world. The U.N. trusteeships for emerging nations in Africa have all been General Assembly type trusteeships. The United States should oppose changing the present trusteeship to another form. This is not a General Assembly trusteeship, where we cannot fortify. Therefore the United States should maintain the policy of retaining the present trusteeship under the United Nations Security Council, retaining the right of the United States to fortify and to keep fortified and to protect these islands and their people against aggression. We do have the correlative responsibility and duty to help these people generously. So I believe the United States should help these people generously. I believe we American people owe these people this firm and continuing duty. That is why I favor this bill so completely.

The President approved this trusteeship agreement. And every President of the United States since has maintained this trusteeship and acted to implement it. I compliment President Truman on his quick action and foresight in signing into law House Joint Resolution 233, to make it Public Law 204 of the 80th Congress—cited as Public Law 80-204.

This act insured that we were able to keep this area and good people for the free world, so they will be protected and maintained and helped to progress under the trusteeship of the United States. This is in the true American tradition of the people of the United States.

I intend to ask for a rollcall on the final passage of this legislation today to show: First, to the people of the trust islands how strongly the U.S. Representatives in Congress of the American people stand behind them for their and our mutual security and defense.

Second, this rollcall is to show that we, the elected representatives of the American people in the U.S. Congress will continue to act to assist the trust island people for progress, prosperity, and peace.

Third, this rollcall is to show that the U.S. Congress intends to maintain this United Nations Security Council trusteeship jointly in the future, and adequately to finance U.S. civilian administration as well as progress and development.

Fourth, this rollcall is notice to other nations, allies, neutrals, friendly and unfriendly countries as well, that the United States intends firmly to continue this course and policy, to provide a hopeful future for all the free island peoples of the Pacific on a longtime basis.

Cheers and congratulations to our U.S. friends, the fine people of the trust islands of the Pacific, on your excellent progress and wonderful future.

I hope that this committee will see that the trusteeship for our own U.S.

security as a backup for the trouble on the Asian mainland is maintained, and that we do everything we can on a strategic basis to see that this will be the bastion of protection in the Pacific, if anything should happen on the Asian mainland or in the Southwest Pacific.

I compliment the committee for an excellent bill and I hope that every Member, for this reason as well, will support this measure.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my wholehearted support of H.R. 5277 and also the sense of urgency which I feel toward early action by Congress on this bill.

When we assumed the responsibility for administering the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands at the close of World War II, our mandate from the United Nations prescribed that we would devote our resources to eventual self-government for the people of the trust territory, and to this end we were to provide for their economic, social, and political welfare.

After nearly 20 years of our administration, the people of the trust territory still live in conditions that are largely primitive, without adequate schools, medical facilities, roads, water development, communications, sewage disposal, and many of the attributes of civilized life. Within the past few years, we have begun to move more rapidly. We have built schools, but still only half of Micronesia's eighth-grade graduates are able to go on to high school because of lack of space. With an increasing birth rate, only an estimated one of four will be able to continue with secondary school by 1972.

There are six district hospitals for these 90,000 inhabitants of Micronesia spread over an island complex of 3 million square miles, and these facilities as well as outlying dispensaries are hopelessly short of truly qualified medical personnel. The construction of sewage facilities is absolutely necessary to control diseases.

For the health and education of these people, and for other reasons, it is of utmost importance that we act on this bill reported out of the Interior Committee to launch a broad-scale attack on these problems. Recognizing the need for infusion of new funds, we are asking that the presently authorized \$17½ million trust territory expenditures for fiscal 1967 be increased by \$7½ million, and that the allocation for each of the next 2 years be raised to \$35 million. I am proud to be associated with the committee which is asking for these appropriations and making the request in the name of self-sufficiency and self-government of the trust territory as goals for the near future.

Our present financial assistance in the territory goes to administrative expenses, operation of the six district hospitals and some 120 dispensaries, immunization programs, the training of medical and nursing personnel, public, elementary, and secondary schools which have 23,000 students enrolled at present, air and sea transportation, roads and streets, agricultural facilities, power and water, and other public works.

The bill we are considering today is a

3-year program to upgrade our efforts in all these areas, after which we will act on the High Commissioner's recommendations as to results and future needs. The Department of the Interior which presently is charged with the administration of the trust territory firmly supports the legislation because of the expanding population of Micronesia and because of the urgently needed expansions in physical plant. The past capital improvement program has been inadequate, and we on the committee feel that the increased appropriations should go to a number of specific uses.

There is an immediate need for teacher housing, one factor in holding down the secondary education capacity, and new schools are urgently needed. Under present budgetary restrictions, there are cases recorded of schools falling into total disrepair with long months of delay before reconstruction can begin. Student enrollments will increase by 50 percent in the elementary schools in the next 5 years and will triple in the secondary schools. More teachers, more housing, more facilities are needed immediately.

Housing must be provided for medical personnel who cannot otherwise be recruited for service in these farflung islands. There are almost no medical doctors in the trust territory at present and few registered nurses. Many new hospital beds are urgently needed and far more dispensary facilities, as well as increased generating capacity.

Transportation over the vast distances of the trust territory is a major problem. Some atolls are serviced only by trading schooners which may arrive as infrequently as once every 6 months. More airstrip construction is vital, as well as lighting for existing runways. Communications must be improved, particularly to handle emergencies in an area where the transportation system is so erratic, and a microwave radio network between the districts is considered a must for the immediate future. More service vessels are needed by the government to support interisland activities and to provide emergency service.

We need further to develop ground water services and distribution, and completely renovate the inadequate sewerage system. Road construction must be accelerated, dock facilities built, dredging operations carried out, and power utilities improved and expanded.

A low-cost housing program is eminently desirable for these people, many of whom live in corrugated shanties, and the public buildings are in dire need of repair. Certain other government services, made necessary by the lack of a diversified economy, must also be financed, for example, the operation of cold storage plants.

Agricultural assistance must be stepped up to get the trust territory more self-sufficient. At present, copra production and fisheries are the only major sources of income, but recent land-clearing operations have demonstrated the possibility of raising livestock. Fish processing facilities would be a major boon as well.

The list of priorities seems endless. Yet, when we consider the primitive way of life in the territory, where inhabitants

still take long voyages across the open sea in small sailing vessels, where imported generators provide the only source of power, where diseases which we have long ago eliminated in the United States are still prevalent, where trade and communication are minimal because of transportation deficiencies, we cannot help being moved to attempt to bring these people, for whose welfare we have accepted responsibility, into the 20th century.

The long-range economic development of the trust territory is being studied now, as planning for the future is vital in order to know how best to accomplish our mission there. A tourist industry, the ocean, and diversified agriculture seem to hold the most promise for tomorrow, but I feel it is imperative that we lay the necessary groundwork now, that these dreams may someday be translated into reality. I urge swift and unanimous action on H.R. 5277 to demonstrate our determination to uphold our solemn international agreement to help the trust territory toward self-sufficiency and self-government through enlightened and well-planned assistance in every facet of the territory's culture.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 5277

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Act of June 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 330), as amended (76 Stat. 171), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. There are authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$25,000,000 for fiscal year 1967 and \$42,000,000 for fiscal year 1968, to remain available until expended, to carry out the provisions of this Act and to provide for a program of necessary capital improvements and public works related to health, education, utilities, highways, transportation facilities, communications, and public buildings: *Provided*, That except for funds appropriated for the activities of the Peace Corps no funds appropriated by any Act shall be used for administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands except as may be specifically authorized by law."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 1, lines 7 and 8, strike out "\$42,000,000 for fiscal year 1968" and insert "\$35,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1968 and 1969."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, am I correctly informed that there are about 90,000 people in this area?

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CAREY. The population of the area is approximately 93,000 and growing.

Mr. GROSS. And this involves, actually, about \$77 million?

Mr. CAREY. The annual level of authorization is now \$17½ million.

Mr. GROSS. But this bill would provide about \$77 million.

Mr. CAREY. Over a 3-year period.

Mr. GROSS. That would run to about \$8,000 per head?

Mr. CAREY. The gentleman is quite correct, on a per capita estimate, but I believe he can well recognize, because of his constant scrutiny of authorizations and appropriations, that these are not funds to be expended on people as such, but these are funds to be expended for communications and for our Government of the trust territory and for facilities to serve the United States in its administration of the area, as well as to serve the people. It might not be quite precise to apply it on a per capita basis.

Mr. GROSS. But on a per capita basis it runs between \$8,000 and \$8,500?

Mr. CAREY. That is quite correct. I know the gentleman realizes that these people are 80 to 95 percent dependent on the United States, having no indigenous industry.

Mr. GROSS. The question is what would happen if we withdrew? What would the United Nations do about this territory?

Mr. CAREY. There are a number of options which would be available, I believe, in that case. Among probably the first would be the renewal of and quickened interest in this area by Far Eastern neighbors, assuming new jurisdiction in the area, as they did once before through conquest.

Mr. GROSS. Who did the gentleman say would have an interest in this area?

Mr. CAREY. I would suspect a great many of the Far Eastern nations would have renewed interest; possibly the Japanese, the Chinese, and so forth.

Mr. GROSS. It would revert to whoever got there first with the most troops, or something like that?

Mr. CAREY. Something of that kind might well result in conflict, in order to determine the actual control of the area, yes.

Mr. GROSS. The famous or infamous United Nations, whichever way one wants it, would be powerless to do anything about it? They are without any means to support this territory now, as I understand it.

Mr. CAREY. I would agree with the gentleman that the United Nations would have no means to support this kind of territory; that is correct.

Mr. GROSS. So they are an impotent, paper organization.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. I believe the gentleman from Iowa would be interested in this evaluation of his question.

If our assistance to the trust territory was withdrawn, that Nation would then probably first seek to go it alone, so to speak, to be independent.

The gentleman from Iowa well knows what has happened in other areas of the world when a nation seeks independence before it is ready for independence through economic ability to support itself. That support would have to come from somewhere else, and probably we would wind up with a situation in Micronesia much like the situation we have in certain African nations and elsewhere in the world. We would wind up spending considerably more money in trying to salvage what is left of a bad situation

than we do here in trying to do what is right.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, that leads me to reemphasize the question I asked a while ago with respect to the strategic value of these islands. Why does President Johnson take it upon himself to join in an action against South Africa, Rhodesia, and Portuguese Mozambique? Why does he join with the British in attempting to strangle the economy and destroy the Government of Rhodesia, and then, by the domino process, hope to strangle and destroy the Governments of South Africa and Portugal when all three are making a contribution to the defense of this country? Can anybody answer the question as to why one rule is applied to the Pacific area and another and venomous attitude toward these governments in Africa? If friends and our defense are worth considering in the Pacific, the same is true in Africa.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield if you can give me an answer.

Mr. KYL. I can only answer the gentleman from Iowa in this respect, I will say: We can agree with the suggestion he makes in posing his question. He certainly would not want that same condition to prevail in the trust territories.

Mr. GROSS. No, but the question is why does this situation prevail? That is the question for which I find no answer from any reasonable person.

Mr. KYL. In the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and here on the floor members of that committee, having jurisdiction such as we have, have sought to prevent that kind of a situation from happening here.

Mr. GROSS. I point out to my colleague from Iowa that South Africa, Rhodesia, and Portuguese Mozambique have never been in the handout program, they have never ridden the American gravy train as have some other areas of the world, including that which is represented in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the report accompanying the bill is silent as to the annual expenditures being made by other agencies of the U.S. Government in the trust territory. It would be interesting to know in view of the very substantial increases here proposed.

On the basis of the meager information provided, this bill is too rich for me. As this Nation plunges deeper into debt, the hue and cry is for the spending of more money on the far corners of the earth. This is another example of it.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask, if I may, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], about his mathematics. Did I understand the gentleman from Iowa to say that this was an expenditure of \$8,500 per year per person?

Mr. GROSS. No, I did not say that. I asked the question.

Mr. MORTON. I beg your pardon. I misunderstood you. It figures out to a little over \$350 per year per person.

Mr. GROSS. I asked if it figured out to that amount. I do not know.

Mr. MORTON. Using the figure of 90,000, which is the best population figure we have arrived at, it is something

less than \$400 per person as the cost of this program for 3 years.

Mr. GROSS. On the basis of \$77 million?

Mr. MORTON. On the basis of more than that; \$90 million.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORTON. Certainly.

Mr. CAREY. On the area basis I have estimated it comes out to \$26 per square mile of area we are covering here. You cannot do very much for any piece of real estate on a basis of \$26 per square mile.

Mr. MORTON. Is this wet area or dry area?

Mr. CAREY. It is a combination of wet and dry area. It depends on the day you visit the islands.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The offices of the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific and the Deputy High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific shall hereafter be known as the Governor of the Trust Territory of the Pacific and the Lieutenant Governor of the Trust Territory of the Pacific, respectively. Appointment hereafter made to the office of the Governor of the Trust Territory of the Pacific shall be made by the Secretary of the Interior.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 9, strike out all of section 2.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and wish to advise the Committee of the Whole House that the committee found no reason whatsoever to support this change of nomenclature in that it appeared to be the idea of someone who wished to bring it in line with some other area and we found no purpose for the suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time only for the purpose of personally commending the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] for the knowledgeable and effective manner in which he has handled this legislation today, his first obligation of its kind for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs—in other words, his maiden operation on behalf of our committee.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON], the counterpart of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] on the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, for his usual cooperative and effective assistance in support of such legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GETTYS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5277) to amend the act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 388, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 371, nays 15, not voting 46, as follows:

[Roll No. 43]

YEAS—371

Abbutt	Burke, Fla.	Downing
Abernethy	Burke, Mass.	Dulski
Adair	Burleson	Duncan
Adams	Burton, Calif.	Dwyer
Addabbo	Burton, Utah	Eckhardt
Albert	Bush	Edmondson
Anderson, Ill.	Button	Edwards, Ala.
Anderson, Tenn.	Byrne, Pa.	Edwards, Calif.
Andrews, Ala.	Byrnes, Wis.	Edwards, La.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Cabell	Ellberg
Annunzio	Carey	Erlenborn
Arends	Carter	Esch
Ashbrook	Casey	Eshleman
Ashley	Cederberg	Evans, Colo.
Ashmores	Chamberlain	Everett
Aspinall	Clark	Evins, Tenn.
Ayres	Clausen, Don H.	Fallon
Baring	Clawson, Del.	Farbstein
Bates	Cleveland	Fascell
Belcher	Cohelan	Feighan
Bell	Collier	Findley
Bennett	Colmer	Fino
Berry	Conable	Fisher
Betts	Conte	Flood
Bevill	Corbett	Foley
Blester	Corman	Ford, Gerald R.
Bingham	Cramer	Fountain
Blackburn	Culver	Fraser
Blanton	Daniels	Friedel
Blatnik	Davis, Ga.	Fulton, Pa.
Boggs	Davis, Wis.	Fulton, Tenn.
Bolton	de la Garza	Fuqua
Brademas	Delaney	Galifianakis
Brasco	Denney	Gallagher
Bray	Derwinski	Gardner
Brinkley	Devine	Garmatz
Brock	Dickinson	Gathings
Brotzman	Dingell	Gettys
Brown, Mich.	Dole	Gialmo
Brown, Ohio	Donohue	Gilbert
Broyhill, N.C.	Dorn	Gonzalez
Broyhill, Va.	Dow	Goodell
Buchanan	Dowdy	Goodling
		Gray
		Green, Oreg.

Green, Pa.	MacGregor	Roth
Griffiths	Machen	Roudebush
Grover	Mahon	Roush
Gubser	Mailliard	Roybal
Gude	Marsh	Rumsfeld
Gurney	Mathias, Calif.	Ruppe
Hagan	Matsunaga	Ryan
Haley	May	Sandman
Halleck	Mayne	Satterfield
Halpern	Meeds	St Germain
Hamilton	Meskill	St. Onge
Hammer-	Michel	Saylor
schmidt	Miller, Calif.	Schadeberg
Hanley	Miller, Ohio	Scheuer
Hansen, Wash.	Mills	Schneebell
Hardy	Minish	Schweiker
Harrison	Mink	Schwengel
Harsha	Minshall	Scott
Harvey	Mize	Selden
Hawkins	Monagan	Shibley
Heys	Montgomery	Shriver
Hechler, W. Va.	Moore	Sikes
Heckler, Mass.	Moorhead	Sisk
Helstoski	Morgan	Skubitz
Henderson	Morris, N. Mex.	Slack
Hicks	Morse, Mass.	Smith, Calif.
Hollfield	Morton	Smith, Iowa
Holland	Mosher	Smith, N.Y.
Horton	Moss	Snyder
Hosmer	Multer	Springer
Howard	Murphy, Ill.	Stafford
Hull	Murphy, N.Y.	Staggers
Ichord	Myers	Stanton
Irwin	Natcher	Steed
Jarman	Nedzi	Steiger, Ariz.
Joelson	Nelsen	Steiger, Wis.
Johnson, Calif.	Nichols	Stratton
Johnson, Pa.	Nix	Stubblefield
Jonas	O'Hara, Ill.	Stuckey
Jones, Ala.	Olsen	Sullivan
Jones, Mo.	O'Neal, Ga.	Taft
Jones, N.C.	O'Neill, Mass.	Talcott
Karsten	Ottlinger	Taylor
Karth	Passman	Teague, Calif.
Kastenmeier	Patman	Teague, Tex.
Kazen	Patten	Thompson, Ga.
Kee	Pelly	Thompson, N.J.
Keith	Perkins	Thompson, Wis.
Kelly	Pettis	Tuck
King, Calif.	Philbin	Tunney
King, N.Y.	Pickle	Udall
Kirwan	Pike	Ullman
Kleppe	Pirnie	Utt
Kluczynski	Poage	Van Deerlin
Kornegay	Poff	Vanik
Kupferman	Pollock	Vigorito
Kuykendall	Price, Ill.	Waggonner
Kyl	Pryor	Walker
Kyros	Pucinski	Wampler
Laird	Purcell	Watkins
Landrum	Quile	Watson
Langen	Quillen	Watts
Latta	Railsback	Whalen
Leggett	Randall	Whalley
Lennon	Reid, Ill.	Whitener
Lipscomb	Reid, N.Y.	Whitten
Lloyd	Reifel	Wiggins
Long, La.	Reinecke	Williams, Pa.
Long, Md.	Reuss	Wilson,
Lukens	Rhodes, Ariz.	Charles H.
McCarthy	Rhodes, Pa.	Wolff
McClory	Riegle	Wright
McClure	Rivers	Wyatt
McCulloch	Roberts	Wydler
McDade	Robison	Wyllie
McDonald,	Rodino	Wyman
Mich.	Rogers, Colo.	Yates
McFall	Rogers, Fla.	Young
McMillan	Rooney, N.Y.	Younger
Macdonald,	Rooney, Pa.	Zablocki
Mass.	Rosenthal	Zion

NAYS—15

Cowger	Hutchinson	Smith, Okla.
Dellenback	O'Konski	Vander Jagt
Gross	Price, Tex.	Waldie
Hall	Rarick	Winn
Hunt	Scherle	Zwach

NOT VOTING—46

Barrett	Diggs	Mathias, Md.
Battin	Flynt	O'Hara, Mich.
Boland	Ford	Pepper
Bolling	William D.	Pool
Bow	Frelinghuysen	Rees
Brooks	Gibbons	Resnick
Broomfield	Hanna	Ronan
Brown, Calif.	Hansen, Idaho	Rostenkowski
Cahill	Hathaway	Stephens
Celler	Hébert	Tenzer
Conyers	Herlong	White
Cunningham	Hungate	Widnall
Curtis	Jacobs	Williams, Miss.
Daddario	McEwen	Willis
Dawson	Madden	Wilson, Bob
Dent	Martin	

So the bill was passed.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Battin.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Mathias of Maryland.
Mr. Rees with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
Mr. Ronan with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Hathaway with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Hungate.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Resnick.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Flynt.
Mr. White of Texas with Mr. William D. Ford.
Mr. Pool with Mr. O'Hara of Michigan.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provision of House Resolution 388, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is discharged from further consideration of the bill S. 303.

The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 303

An act to amend the Act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Act of June 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 330), as amended (76 Stat. 171), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. There are authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$25,000,000 for fiscal year 1967 and \$35,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1968 and 1969, to remain available until expended, to carry out the provisions of this Act and to provide for a program of necessary capital improvements and public works related to health, education, utilities, highways, transportation facilities, communications, and public buildings: *Provided*, That except for funds appropriated for the activities of the Peace Corps no funds appropriated by any Act shall be used for administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands except as may be specifically authorized by law."

SEC. 2. The offices of the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and the Deputy High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands shall hereafter be known as the Governor of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and the Lieutenant Governor of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, respectively. Appointment hereafter made to the office of the Governor of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands shall be made by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CAREY

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CAREY moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 303 and insert in lieu thereof the text of H.R. 5277, as passed.

The motion was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 5277) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be afforded 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 40, concerning H.R. 2068, the Veterans Pension and Readjustment Assistance Act of 1967, I was unavoidably absent from the House floor as a result of official business affecting my district. If present, I would have voted "yea."

NEW TOOLS FOR RURAL AMERICA

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, today rural areas and the small towns are truly the "forgotten America."

The 90th Congress, I hope, will take the necessary action to remedy this situation to give rural communities the tools to revitalize their economy.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I appeared before the Select Committee on Small Business to outline plans for the establishment of a Small Town Administration to coordinate the development activities for small towns. I also urged the establishment of a "model small towns" program and the creation of a Federal Public Works Bank to help finance some of the development needs.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. James Chance, the mayor of Maud, Tex.—one of the small towns to which I refer here—also appeared before the committee to describe his community's efforts to develop its human and economic resources. Mr. Chance dramatized the vital need for coordination of Federal development activities affecting small communities throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a copy of Mr. Chance's testimony before the Select Committee on Small Business. I also place in the RECORD my testimony before this committee:

TESTIMONY OF JAMES CHANCE, BOWIE COUNTY, TEX.

My name is James Chance. I am the Mayor of Maud, Texas, and a small business-

man in the commercial and residential construction business, operating in Maud and other small towns in Northeast Texas.

Maud was established about 1880, and was a busy community for many years, reaching a peak population of about 1500 during World War II. At the present time, Maud has a population of 1000. Other than farming, ranching, and some small service and retail establishments in Maud itself, most local employment is based on the Red River Army Depot about 10 miles away, which has peaks and valleys of employment, depending upon national defense requirements. Maud is 18 miles from Texarkana which has a population of about 50,000, including Texarkana-Arkansas. For the last three years, the town of Maud has been working hard attempting to obtain new industries. The problems we have encountered are as follows:

1. Our downtown area is in bad condition. We have had many prospects come to Maud and turn away as soon as they saw the deterioration of the downtown area which consists of two blocks of business buildings on both sides of the street. About 50 percent of these buildings are vacant.

2. Our townspeople recognized that we did not have the expert knowledge to do our own planning, or how to go about getting a new industry. We did not have the money to hire a specialist. We applied to ARA (Area Redevelopment Administration) and they gave a technical assistance grant to a firm of industrial consultants who worked with us from that point on. With their help and the help of our Congressman, we filed applications with the Department of Housing and Urban Development with ARA and EDA (Economic Development Administration), with the Farmers Home Administration and the Small Business Administration, and we checked with other agencies such as HEW (Health, Education and Welfare) and OEO (Office of Economic Opportunity).

3. Our situation at this moment is that we received a sewer system grant and loan from Accelerated Public Works, which was handled through the Community Facility Administration, now a part of HUD. Up to this point, we had individual septic tanks. At the present, we have pending in the Farmers Home Administration our application for a loan and grant for a water system, and a sewer application to extend our system to the industrial park area. We also have a pending application with SBA for the Maud Industrial Foundation for a furniture plant to employ up to 200 people. This is under the SBA's 502 Program.

4. Maud is not eligible for EDA industrial loans because Bowie County lost its designation as a redevelopment area—but Maud is in worse condition than when ARA and EDA were formed, because of its downward population trend.

5. Our experience with federal agencies has pointed up these facts:

- a. By ourselves we are not equipped to handle the many programs they offer, and to know which will help us.

- b. We cannot plan beyond our own town limits without assistance.

- c. We are too poor as a community to participate as required in some programs—the 20 percent SBA asks our local development company to put in the project is too much for us—we can not come up with the required \$75,000. We are also having trouble with 50 percent of the water-sewer application with Farmers Home Administration, and it is not certain that FHA can even give up to the 50 percent grant. If they don't, the water is out, and if we don't get the water, the industry will not come to Maud.

- d. We are unable to obtain satisfactory private financing for the loan portion of the water-sewer system since municipal interest rates (revenue bonds) are exorbitant because of today's tight money situation. A federal guarantee program, similar to pres-

ent federal programs for the development and purchase of individual homes, should be considered by the Committee.

e. An inconsistency and inflexibility in certain federal requirements should be eliminated in cases where we are dealing with the first or "start-up" industry as in Maud. In particular, there should be a greater allowance applied toward the 20 percent local contribution for that portion of the town's water and sewer system directly related to the development of the industry's site. This is the equivalent of, and in lieu of, cash contribution. It can be assumed that with a fully developed industrial tract, properly planned, that subsequent service industries will follow in due course.

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN WRIGHT PATMAN BEFORE THE HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. Chairman: I appreciate this opportunity to testify in support of the efforts of the Committee to explore ways and means to provide the type of assistance that our smaller communities desperately need today for business expansion.

You have just heard the testimony of Mr. James Chance, Mayor of Maud, Texas. Mr. Chance is uniquely qualified to present the problems of Small Town America—first, because Maud is typical of many towns on the periphery of large metropolitan centers, possessing the deep determination to rebuild and move forward, but totally lacking in the physical resources so essential to the initiation of such a task. Mr. Chance is a small home builder, as well as the Mayor of Maud, and together with other highly motivated public citizens, is one of the prime movers in the establishment of a Section 502 Local Development Company, determined to bring to Maud its first major industry—a furniture factory.

SMALL TOWN AMERICA

It is apparent from Mr. Chance's testimony that Small Town America today can better be termed "Forgotten America." He has underscored, it seems to me, from a very practical point of view, what happens to a small town businessman serving his town without compensation as he attempts to apply for assistance under a variety of programs administered by the federal government.

It is incredible that he finds himself in the position of explaining to one Department of government exactly what type assistance has been applied for in another Department of government or agency many months earlier. Surely small towns have a right to expect that the federal government, with its staff of experts and field representatives could advise each other on a continuing basis the status of applications before each individual Department. Large cities can afford complete staffs of experts whose sole purpose is to coordinate and program federal assistance for the benefit of the metropolitan area. As a minimum, therefore, we should call upon the executive branch, and this can be done administratively under existing authority today, to coordinate all activities involving the small towns such as Maud, both in Washington and to assign in each county of the United States a federal employee capable of assisting each town as it attempts to help itself. The Farmers Home Administration, for example, with its county office structure could easily have assigned to it an assistant for industrial and community development. And it seems that at the highest political level possible in Washington, one man should be authorized by the President to speak for Small Town America, and all of the aspects involved in helping these towns to survive and grow. A Small Town Administration could easily be created, functioning in any one of three Departments or agencies—HUD, Agriculture, SBA.

I would imagine that the average Congressman spends interminable hours, as I

have, in arranging meetings in Washington with the highest possible representatives from each Department having an interest in the development of small towns. These meetings are always helpful and all federal officials indicate nothing but the fullest cooperation and support; but then these officials return to their respective Departments and agencies, leaving the small towns to do all things for themselves without any overlapping assistance from the Federal government. This is certainly the story of Maud. Meetings have been held on at least three occasions, as much as six months apart, only to find that we are right back where we began.

The Select Committee, in outlining the scope of its present survey has demonstrated its full understanding that in small towns the development of small business cannot be separated from community development (basic public facilities), since one without the other is doomed to failure from the outset. To determine the soundness of a small business loan any analyst must have a clear picture of the facilities inventory of the town, its past indebtedness, and its legal capacity for basic facility development. The same can, of course, be said for the public facilities analyst—he must know the state of the economy and the prospects for business growth of the town. Therefore a statutory merger of these two functions or at least very close coordination appears to be essential. If we accept as a basic proposition, and I believe we all do, as the President and the Secretaries of both HUD and Agriculture and the SBA Administrator have stated, that we must start now utilizing all of our natural resources, both physical and economic in a far more intelligent manner than has been true in the past, then we must do more than wishfully suggest that it should be possible to utilize more intelligently our vast land resources. We need not accept the proposition that by 1980, 75% to 85% of our population will be living in less than 2% of our land area. The redistribution of major industrial plants away from congested and smog-ridden urban and suburban areas into counties and small towns that are now dying on the vine for lack of employment income and for lack of tax ratables, should be this nation's number one domestic priority.

NEW TOWNS FOR RURAL AREAS

The House Banking and Currency Committee, which I have the honor of serving as Chairman, has taken important steps forward in the last (89th) Congress, by readying the basic tools for the creation of new towns that can permit decentralized expansion of a number of instant or modern industrial towns and cities. But have we done enough to make sure that Rural America is ready to receive these new towns? In the 89th Congress we enacted a Model Cities Program which in time will reshape and accelerate the rebuilding of our modern urban centers. This year we will be considering proposals to provide comprehensive planning for small town and rural county development. The next logical step in connection with this type of rural planning is to establish a model small town program similar to our urban model cities program. If we fail to do so, then metropolitan growth will be stymied—if the small towns now lying on the periphery of metropolitan areas become ghost towns.

The Select Committee can perform a most valuable service in coordinating the efforts of various Standing Committees, many of whom seek to provide a form of assistance for Small Town America. The Administration's small town proposals could well be evaluated initially by this Committee, to make certain there is no duplication and to call attention to gaps that have developed. Recently, the Joint Economic Committee completed a study of this Nation's public works needs and analyzed existing methods of financing. It

is apparent that new methods must be devised if rural America is to be developed in time to help slow down in-migration to our badly congested metropolitan centers. The time has come to consider a Federal Public Works bank operating as a guarantee program similar to that now provided for Housing. The Department of Agriculture has operated a crop emergency program successfully for years—could it not operate a "lender of last resort" community development program? The development of small towns (public facilities) is stalemated today by insufficient grant funds and unavailability of private loan funds except at exorbitant interest. The 89th Congress will be remembered as the Congress that declared war on decay and rot (physical and human) in our large metropolitan cities. Let the 90th Congress be remembered as the Congress that enacted the "Small Town America" program and by providing the tools for orderly accelerated community development provide the means for these towns themselves to attract and retain industry.

THE PLAINSMAN

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a brief excerpt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, today the President is returning from his long trip to the Guam Conference, demonstrating once again that no effort is too arduous if there is some hope that the cause of peace and better understanding can be promoted.

The rank and file of the American people, in my judgment, support the President in his efforts to find an honorable end to the war in Vietnam.

An old friend of the President, Charles A. Guy, Jr., editor and publisher of the Lubbock Avalanche-Journal, Lubbock, Tex., who has for many years written a column called "The Plainsman," a few weeks ago wrote a story about the President which seems appropriate for printing in the RECORD at this time. I should like to call the column to the attention of Congress and the press, as follows:

[From the Lubbock (Tex.) Avalanche-Journal, Jan. 13, 1967]

THE PLAINSMAN

Jim Ray, from up in Hale County, sent me a copy of a column by an old comrade in arms, Bob Considine, which ran a week or so ago in the San Antonio Light. Bob's thesis was: "Let's lay off Lyndon Johnson this week."

There are no better writers around than Bob Considine, so it is not surprising that his points were succinctly made. He noted that the President is being blamed for countless things—ranging from starting the war in Vietnam to the draft deferment of George Hamilton—not of his making. He argued, tellingly, that the very nature of the Presidential job is such that whoever holds it must make decisions every day which must be unpopular with many people.

A great many people always are ready to "follow the crowd." So of late, as the President's detractors have been having a field day, many of the rank and filers have joined in with a whoop and a holler. If we've been told once that the President's popularity, once miraculously high, has slipped noticeably, we've been told it 1,000 times. Actually,

the popularity of all Presidents goes up and down like a yo-yo and Mr. Johnson has broken out no new trails in this department.

An even better idea than "Let's lay off Lyndon Johnson this week" would be, it seems to me, an honest description in depth of the President, done for the widest dissemination by someone who has known him intimately for a long period of time and who has unusual ability in communicating facts.

Whether Bob Considine knows the President intimately enough to do the job I do not know. But former Texan Bill White, now of the Washington press elite, does and so do several working newspapermen in Texas. One is Charlie Green, editor of the American-Statesman in Austin. Another is Harry Provence, editor of the Waco News-Tribune. Still another is Bob Baskin, of the Dallas News. And they are not, by any means, the only ones.

Men of personal and professional integrity, they knew the President before he became prominent. They knew him as a Congressional secretary, as a member of the House and Senate. They know him now. They have traveled with him through the years, have lived with him, seen him, suspenders dangling, with shaving soap on his face. They know him as a human being, not as a perambulating national monument, which is how all Presidents appear to most people.

President Johnson, like the rest of us, is neither a saint nor a devil. He is a man of many moods; his personality has many sides.

Writing men, like those mentioned above, could give the public an accurate and encompassing picture of the Man in the White House, one which 99.44 per cent of his fellow Americans have never seen. This picture should be drawn now, not left to history, certainly not to his enemies.

The country knows the President as a man of tremendous energy. The people have been told that he is a driver, and he is; that he can get as mad as the fellow next door at times and, even as you and I, sometimes may show a flash of honest anger or indignation.

What they don't know is that Lyndon Johnson can be and often is a very gentle and sympathetic man, a man of great understanding and tolerance. What they don't know is that Lyndon Johnson to this good day never has forgotten an old friend, that he has a talent for gratitude; that he is an open-handed, gracious host in his own home, a man with deep affection for family and friends.

Actually, President Johnson, the man, is about as human as they come. He is not the ogre that his political foes, including those who'd grab the Presidential post for themselves if they could, would have people believe.

As one who has known the President quite well over a long period of years and who is personally fond of him, I'd be the next to the last man to contend that he is perfect. The last one to so argue would be the President, himself.

Also, despite long friendship and affection, I don't agree with all Mr. Johnson, as a public official, has done and seeks to do. But our differences are honest. Although he is aware of them, his personal attitudes toward me are as they always have been: warm, friendly, kind, thoughtful and generous.

This is the Lyndon Johnson people do not generally know but, nevertheless, he is the Lyndon Johnson they should know and have a right to know.

Somebody ought to do a personality study on the President, fully aboveboard and without thought of gilding the lily, for national circulation.

As a human being, as well as the head of the greatest nation in the world, he has that coming to him.

DIRECT ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, were all our presidential elections conducted with the same surety and nonpartisan enthusiasm as the first, when George Washington became President, there would be no need for legislation to change the present method of electing our President. Such has not been the case.

The electoral college method of election, devised 177 years ago, was intended to assure the choice of wise and able men. But the advent of political parties and pressures removed much of the effectiveness of the original system.

As a result of the electoral method of choosing a President, an elector can vote against the candidate he was chosen to vote—as was the case in 1948, 1956, and 1960. As a result of this method, John Quincy Adams and Benjamin Harrison became President when Andrew Jackson and Grover Cleveland had larger popular votes. Eleven other Presidents have been elected with less than a majority of the popular vote. This is hardly democratic.

Nor is it democratic for a system to allow 12 States, through their electoral vote, to dominate the other 38, to determine an election.

James Madison and Benjamin Franklin supported popular election of the President at the Constitutional Convention. Since at least 1797 there have been attempts to change the electoral system. Today, evidently a large percentage of Americans desire a change, as 63 percent so indicated in their response to a Gallup poll last year. A poll of the members of the 50 State legislatures showed 58.8 percent of those responding in favor of a change.

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which I hope will become the 26th amendment to the Constitution and which provides for direct election of the President and Vice President. Only by some such change can we insure that the popular will will be heard, not frustrated, and that the highest national office will reflect their choice, in a nation "of the people, by the people, and for the people."

PROPOSED AGRICULTURAL PRODUCERS MARKETING ACT OF 1967

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, within the past few days, I have become greatly concerned about a piece of proposed

legislation labeled the Agricultural Producers Marketing Act of 1967.

This piece of legislation purports to make it possible for farm producers to join organizations to protect their interests.

If this is what the bill would do, then all of us would be for it, because all farmers are entitled to join, as all Americans are, the organization of their choice. Certainly we want to enhance the welfare of the farmers as much as possible. However, I am disturbed by this piece of legislation, because I do not know whether it does what it purports to do. I became more disturbed when I had called to my attention yesterday the analysis published by the National Broiler Council entitled "Fair Play or Foul Ball." I have read this document, which is an analysis of the situation, and I am not yet ready to make up my mind about exactly how I feel toward it. I thought it would be well if the membership could have an opportunity to read it. For that reason I am asking unanimous consent to have included with my remarks in the body of the RECORD this publication by the National Broiler Council entitled "Fair Play or Foul Ball," which is an analysis of S. 109.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

FAIRPLAY OR FOUL BALL?—AN ANALYSIS OF S. 109

The National Broiler Council supports the right of any broiler grower or integrator to select his own customers or suppliers. This right would be jeopardized by enactment of S. 109 and companion measures, known as the "Agricultural Producers Marketing Act of 1967". NBC joins the authors of this bill in support of its stated objective—"To control unfair trade practices affecting producers of agricultural products and associations of such producers". However, it is our considered judgment that much of S. 109 is unnecessary because many of the prohibitions against unfair trade practices and remedies for them already exist in our laws. We find other provisions of S. 109 unfair, unreasonable or unclear. We are pleased to present the reasons for our position in this leaflet.

S. 109 IS UNFAIR

The National Broiler Council believes that S. 109, called the "fairplay" bill, is patently unfair in that it affords certain protections to producers but does not provide similar safeguards for those who deal with producers' organizations. Thus, S. 109 flies in the face of all our laws, the spirit of which is equal justice for all.

S. 109 IS UNREASONABLE

S. 109 violates a principle which until now has been held inviolate in our laws, explicitly recognized as such by the U.S. Supreme Court and the U.S. Department of Justice, that a purchaser can choose to deal with whomever he wishes. In the language of S. 109 it is unlawful "... to discriminate or threaten to discriminate against any producer ... because of his membership in or contract with an association of producers. . . ." However, a processor, handler or, in the case of the broiler industry, an integrator may have justifiable economic reasons for not dealing with a given producer.

The broiler integrator would have to be endlessly on guard. His refusal to deal with or his payment of a higher price to a producer who is not a member of a bargaining association than he pays to association members, no matter what his economic justifica-

tions appear unnecessary in view of Section 4 of the Clayton Act . . . providing for treble damage actions for persons injured by reason of anything forbidden in the antitrust laws."

tions appear unnecessary in view of Section 4 of the Clayton Act . . . providing for treble damage actions for persons injured by reason of anything forbidden in the antitrust laws."

Suppose S. 109 becomes law. One effect could well be the dominance of bargaining organizations as representing producers in their dealings with integrators. In that event, can integrators be sure that the grower whose skills assure the consumer of a quality product will be rewarded? Will this reward be decided by the bargaining association or the market? In most broker contracts today, quality and efficiency are rewarded with incentive payments. Would not the bargaining organization, in the nature of things, become the great leveler, penalizing the efficient and rewarding the inefficient?

There is legitimate reason for concern that enactment of S. 109 would bring results that go far beyond those intended by proponents of the measure. While S. 109 would pound needless nails into a structure that already gives adequate protection to agricultural producers who wish to join a bargaining association, passage of the legislation would give privileges to bargaining groups not enjoyed by any other group, certainly not broiler integrators. In so doing, this ill-conceived legislation would tend to unbalance the principle of fairness in business, a principle protected by the bulletin checks and balances that have been eminently successful in keeping free enterprise remarkably free and fair for buyers and seller alike. Clearly, S. 109 is unreasonable.

S. 109 IS UNCLEAR

The inclusion in S. 109 of prohibitions against "threats of interference" deserves special comment. Nowhere in the bill are such threats defined nor, for that matter, is "interference" defined. Shall we legislate against a shadow? Who is to say what constitutes a threat? Shall integrators have to operate with a sword of Damocles hanging over them? Will they have to live in constant fear that anything they might say or do in the normal give-and-take of the marketplace could be construed by someone as a threat to someone? If, for example, one integrator makes a better offer to a grower than does another integrator, will the first integrator be charged with discrimination? It may well be that if the first integrator doesn't make a better offer, a competitor may be successful in signing up that grower.

Where in S. 109 are threats and discrimination against integrators prohibited?

S. 109 IS UNNECESSARY

No less an authority than The Honorable Paul Rand Dixon, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, stated of House versions of S. 109 last year that many of the acts proscribed by what is presently Section 4 of the bills are already prohibited by the Sherman Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act. The section of the S. 109-type legislation referred to by Chairman Dixon contains the heart of the legislation, the many prohibitions against interfering or even threatening to interfere with any producer who joins and belongs to an association of producers. Chairman Dixon said further, "The jurisdiction of the Commission to prevent unfair methods of competition embraces even greater latitude. The Commission may order a stop to unfair methods of competition that do not assume the proportions of anti-trust violations."

PENALTIES UNDER S. 109

S. 109 provides for treble damage actions against violators. The National Broiler Council agrees with the position of FTC Chairman Dixon who has stated "The provisions . . . providing for treble damage ac-

tions appear unnecessary in view of Section 4 of the Clayton Act . . . providing for treble damage actions for persons injured by reason of anything forbidden in the antitrust laws."

The bills also provide for criminal penalties of fines, jail sentences, or both. It is a canon of criminal law that violations must be clearly defined. They are at best vaguely defined in S. 109.

Finally, the standards in S. 109 which authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to request injunctive action against alleged violators are so indefinite that a court would have difficulty in determining whether an injunction is called for. On what grounds is the Secretary of Agriculture or a court to decide when an integrator is "about to engage in any act or practice prohibited by Section 4 . . .", such as "threatening to interfere with . . . any producer in the exercise of his right to join and belong to an association of producers"?

POINT BY POINT REBUTTAL

Let's take a closer look at several of the prohibitions in Section 4 of S. 109, as they would affect the broiler industry. The bill would authorize criminal prosecution, treble damages and court injunctions against integrators and other handlers, if they:

a) "interfere with or restrain or threaten to interfere with or restrain, by boycott, coercion, or any unfair or deceptive act or practice, any producer in the exercise of his right to join and belong to an association of producers".

The plain fact of the matter is that federal and state laws specifically prohibit collective boycotts, restraints, or coercion. The practical effect, therefore, would be to require the integrator under the threat of criminal penalties to prove his non-discriminatory reasons for not dealing with an association member.

b) "discriminate or threaten to discriminate against any producer with respect to price, quantity, quality, or other terms of purchase or acquisition of agricultural commodities because of his membership in or contract with an association of producers".

Under this provision an integrator might be subject to harsh penalties, or at least lengthy litigation, if for any reason he purchased different amounts or grades from association members and non-members, or otherwise treated them differently.

c) "coerce or intimidate any producer or other person to breach, cancel, or otherwise terminate a membership agreement or marketing contract with an association of producers".

State law prohibits inducing a person to breach his contract with another.

d) "pay or loan money, give any thing of value in excess of the true market value of any agricultural commodity which is being purchased, or offer any other inducement or reward to a producer for refusing to or ceasing to belong to an association of producers".

Payment of money to induce a breach of contract is now actionable under state law. Also, "true market value" is virtually impossible to determine fairly and accurately.

SUMMARY

As stated at the outset, S. 109 is unfair, unreasonable, unclear and unnecessary.

Unfair. It prohibits conduct on the part of integrators but does not prohibit identical or even similar conduct on the part of bargaining organizations.

Unreasonable. It jeopardizes the historic right of integrators to select their own suppliers.

Unclear. It voices certain prohibitions, such as those against "threats", without defining them and then proceeds to establish criminal penalties based on such vagaries.

Unnecessary. In large part it duplicates prohibitions against conduct already proscribed under federal and/or state laws.

What appears in this proposed legislation

to be fairplay for producers turns out, on closer examination, to be nothing but a foul ball for everyone concerned and a third strike for the American food marketing system which is the envy of the entire world.

FIREARMS

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, supporters of rigid gun controls are again seizing upon the Nation's rising crime rate to create the impression that open sales of weapons are a significant factor in the prevalence of lawlessness across the land. The strategy is based upon the fallacious philosophy that guns and not people are responsible for shootings.

To implement the war on crime, Congress should first remove unrealistic handicaps to law enforcement rather than enact restrictive controls. The best deterrent to violence in the streets is quick and effective apprehension and punishment of criminals. At the moment, one of this Nation's most desperate needs is legislation to nullify Supreme Court decisions that handcuff police instead of criminals.

Proposed legislation to make purchases of firearms difficult for all citizens because a few misuse weapons would be no more valid in logic than to restrict the general sales of automobiles because some drivers abuse the privilege of license and bring death to the highway.

If bureaucratic control of guns is necessary to reduce felonious use of weapons, then similar restrictions would have to be placed on the availability of kitchen knives, nylon stockings, rope, and all other instruments that might possibly be used to threaten or to harm. Rather than deprive Americans of an inherent right, Congress is obliged to provide the way to restore to them the freedom of safe conduct in the city streets.

The attempt to associate President Kennedy's assassination with the need for new gun laws is another artfully misleading device being employed by the more vocal proponents of gun control legislation. You know and I know that a gun would not be hard to come by for a man indoctrinated in the technique of murder under experienced killers in Moscow. In this case, Oswald should never have been allowed back into the States once he denounced his citizenship and embraced international communism.

By the same token, a growing number of those who commit violence against fellow men in this country are hardened criminals who have escaped proper punishment through generous loopholes provided by the courts. And many others have chosen crime as a way of life in the knowledge that they, too, stand an excellent chance of being coddled if caught.

Do not blame guns for our shameful crime rate. In days gone by every man owned a gun. Order was established by law's discipline of those who misused the right to own a weapon, not by making firearms more difficult to obtain.

THE FINE ART OF GRANTSMANSHIP

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include pertinent material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in connection with my criticism of some of the grants currently being made by the National Foundation on Arts and Humanities, there is an excellent article on this subject in the March 17 issue of Time magazine. It calls attention to the whole strange world of Federal "grantsmanship," including a grant of \$50,000 to film the mating of the Amazon butterfly, and another grant to study the rectal temperature of hibernating bears. The article follows:

THE FINE ART OF GRANTSMANSHIP

On most U.S. campuses these days, grantsmanship—the fine art of picking off research funds—is almost as important to professional prestige as the ability to teach or carry out the research once a grant is landed. The competition is keen and the potential prizes are well worth the effort: the Federal Government and private foundations annually present the nation's universities with a \$5 billion bonanza in research money.

To be sure, tough screening and accounting procedures help make certain that the bonanza is not a boondoggle; both the givers and the receivers of grants rightly insist that money invested in research has paid off a hundredfold in scholarly discoveries. Nonetheless, some educators are beginning to wonder about the impact of all that easy-come money on the universities. Salary, prestige and promotion depend upon a scholar's ability to probe and publish—which in turn often depends upon his ability to unearth research grants. "You need the federal loot to do the research to do the book to get the loot," says Stephen Trachtenberg, an assistant to U.S. Education Commissioner Harold Howe. "Research aid comes too easily to the researchers," adds Engineering Science Professor Samuel Silver of Berkeley's Space Sciences Laboratory. "We've come to expect it as our due."

The Golden Touch. The first step in mastering grantsmanship is picking a field that the grant givers consider hot. "I've developed the golden touch," admits a former Justice Department consultant now on the University of Mississippi faculty. "I can get \$100,000 with half an hour on the phone to Washington—I can get rich fighting poverty." Studies of water and air pollution are also big this year, as is any application of computers to human affairs (at Stanford alone there are seven major projects in computer-assisted teaching). There is always plenty of money available from almost any foundation for cardiac disease and cancer research. Although the social sciences get less than 3% of federal research money, psychological studies are beginning to get more help.

Too often, "scholars go where the money is," says University of Chicago Sociologist Philip Hauser. What this means, explains TheodoreSizer, dean of the Harvard Graduate School of Education, is that "researchers are not asking the right questions—they are taking the questions that are easier to research." Scholars often frame their grant proposals broadly enough to blanket their real research interests. The sociologist interested in youth gangs, for example, is more likely to get money for a study of slum neighborhoods. Conversely, a biologist who merely wanted to find out whether a high-protein fish flour was unsafe for human consumption landed a grant by emphasizing

that he wanted to know if the flour would induce cancer.

Awards for Writing. Writing a proposal is also an art. Some grants, argues Lewis Yablonsky, a sociology professor at California's San Fernando Valley State College, are really awards for excellence in writing. It is "a form of seduction—you must titillate them to give the money," says Barry Winograd, a grad student at Cal's Santa Barbara campus. He advises that "somewhat vague phrasing" pays off, along with a tactful reference to omissions in previous research.

Seductive writing sometimes seems to sell projects whose utility is not easily apparent. The Government gave one school \$50,000 to film the mating dance of the Amazon butterfly, while other researchers received a grant to study the rectal temperature of hibernating bears. A team of engineers at the University of Minnesota got \$250,000 from the Government to devise an ideal "experimental city." The only trouble with this otherwise worthy project: no full-time social scientist was involved in the study.

No Time to Contemplate. Scholars tend to consider their research a product to be sold to the highest bidder—although trying out the same project on different grant givers must be done with some care. "If a foundation thinks that you've got a 10% chance of getting the funds from someone else, they're not going to give you the money," explains one Harvard Ph. D. candidate. For some professors, the pursuit of project money is almost a full-time career in itself. "There is a kind of hustle here, like in the business world," contends John Hodges, a British-born Harvard graduate student in the history of science, "and sometimes intellectual contemplation is fitted in between phone calls to Washington." Harvard Graduate Student Steve Barney claims that grants are used "as a bonus for the faculty—like an expense account in business," cites travel grants to libraries, despite the availability of microfilmed copies.

Effective grantsmanship feeds on itself. "When you are doing good research, you attract talented people," says Ohio Researcher John B. Galpault. "You become known as a swinger, and good graduate students want to work for you—then you have to keep them challenged." Once a school has the manpower and equipment, the next grant comes easier. "The rich are getting richer and the poor are going nowhere," says Berkeley's Silver.

If there is any victim in grantsmanship, it is not the Government or the foundations but the undergraduate student. To the professor tied up in the pursuit of research funds, teaching may seem like an unpleasant interruption in his real career. One U.C.L.A. physicist, for example, contends that "a professor who gets three or four men through to their Ph. D. via research is achieving far more than he can by lecturing to a hundred freshman all year." The nation's 1.5 million freshmen are not likely to agree—until they, too, some day need a grant.

THE PUBLIC SPEAKS ON THE STRATTON 3-DAY WEEKEND HOLIDAY BILL, H.R. 1292

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House passed H.R. 2513, to establish a Commission on National Holidays. At that time, as the RECORD shows, I mentioned a bill which I have introduced in this Congress, H.R. 1292,

which does not create any new holidays but rather would shift the dates of four of our major national holidays so that they would fall each year on a Monday, which now occurs only in the case of Labor Day. In this way each of these four holidays, plus Labor Day itself, could be observed as part of a 3-day holiday weekend which we could count on, and look forward to, each year. It would in effect provide for five minivacations to be built into our calendar each year.

In yesterday's debate, Mr. Speaker, I pointed out the very great public interest in and support for this bill which has developed in the past few months.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith two articles which demonstrate the interest in and support for H.R. 1292 that exists across the country. The first is a brief article from *This Week*, the popular Sunday newspaper supplement for March 19, 1967. The second is an article from *Nation's Business* for February 1967. The articles follow:

[From *This Week*, Mar. 19, 1967]

AMERICANS LIKE 3-DAY WEEKENDS

It may come as no surprise, but at least 18 out of every 19 Americans favor national legislation making non-religious holidays fall on Fridays or Mondays, thus giving us more 3-day weekends.

To the amazement of many leisure lovers, the idea has been opposed in Congress for many years. Now, however, there is hope—thanks largely to overwhelming reader response to a recent *This Week* article.

In the article, by Jacob Evans, in a mid-January issue, readers were given the pros and cons and asked to return a ballot showing their views. Mail began pouring in on the following Monday. On Tuesday, 21 stuffed mailbags arrived. It didn't let up for 2 weeks. Practically everyone was in favor of 3-day weekends.

As a result, Rep. Samuel S. Stratton of New York, who has long proposed the holiday changes, is pushing ahead with a new bill guaranteeing four 3-day weekends every year—Washington's Birthday, Memorial Day, Independence Day and Veterans Day.

If 250,000 ballots, many still untabulated, are any indication, Stratton can count on popular support. Here's the latest count:

In favor.....	180,061
Opposed.....	10,094
Sent in blank ballots.....	2,081

[From *Nation's Business*, February 1967]

MONDAY HOLIDAYS: LESS WORK, MORE PROFIT?

Four times this year a holiday will fall in midweek. You and your employees take the day off, go back to the job for a day or more and then have the weekend off.

How about a vest-pocket vacation instead? Forego a holiday on the traditional date and switch it to the nearest Monday. The result: A series of three-day vacations spread neatly over the year. Moreover, it could mean savings or more profits for your business.

What, some say, eat Thanksgiving Turkey on a Monday? Shoot off fireworks on the third of July? Honor our veterans on Nov. 13?

The fact is, holiday changes have been discussed for a number of years and may well come to pass because of new broad-based business support.

Actually why celebrate George Washington's Birthday on Feb. 22, when he was really born on February 11? Or Columbus Day on Oct. 12 when old Chris really discovered America on Oct. 23?

Why the Fourth of July? It was July 2

when the Continental Congress actually adopted the resolution of independence advanced by Richard Henry Lee and John Adams. It was on that day in 1776 when we really declared our independence from Great Britain.

It was July 19 when the Continental Congress ordered the document engrossed and passed a resolution seeking signatures that would lead to its ratification.

It was during George Washington's lifetime that the British introduced the Gregorian calendar to the colonies—advancing all dates 11 days—and hence the Feb. 22 observance.

Oct. 12 is the date that appeared on the "old" calendar in Columbus' wardrobe aboard the *Santa Maria*. Had we shifted the date, though, to accommodate the current Gregorian calendar, we would celebrate Columbus Day on Oct. 23.

All this shows that national holidays Americans are so accustomed to were set arbitrarily and might be observed on entirely different dates today.

SWITCH THE DATES?

For a number of years there has been growing sentiment to change the dates of some of these holidays so that they will be observed instead on the nearest Monday to afford workers a series of three-day vacationettes and avoid the split-week observances now in practice.

The idea has widespread support from business and labor, the travel industry and many others. In fact, about the only opposition comes from those who fear the three-day holiday may increase highway accidents.

The drive for uniform Monday observances of certain holidays may well take on new impetus as a result of a recent survey by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. It asked its members if they would favor Monday observance of such holidays as Washington's Birthday, Memorial Day, Independence Day, Veterans' Day and Thanksgiving, Christmas and New Year's Day were not included. An overwhelming majority—85 per cent—of the almost 10,000 who responded said they would. The National Chamber has taken no official position on the proposal.

Over the past few years several unsuccessful attempts have been made in Congress to adopt resolutions calling for uniform Monday observances. At least one Congressman, Rep. Samuel Stratton (D-N.Y.) is planning to push such legislation in the new Congress.

These traditional holidays are not national holidays as such but rather legal or public holidays. The President and Congress can designate them as holidays only for the District of Columbia and for federal workers around the nation. The states have jurisdiction over holidays they choose to observe and these are set aside either by legislative enactment or executive proclamation.

BUSINESSMAN'S VIEW

Reasons for wanting to change to Monday holidays are many and varied. Among businessmen they tend to fall in three categories. They feel the vacationettes would:

Reduce absenteeism that sometimes surrounds holidays that fall during midweek.

Avoid production interruptions caused by midweek holidays.

Create sales stimulus for many types of businesses whose products and services would be useful in new-found time for recreation. Those who favor change concede it may be difficult to alter Americans' deeply ingrained attachment to traditional dates for traditional celebrations. On the other hand, this may be offset by the lure of several short vacations during the year.

Few exponents of uniform Monday holidays suggest tampering with New Year's Day or Christmas. Many remember the hornet's nest stirred up by Franklin Roosevelt when

he proposed a different Thursday for Thanksgiving.

One of the supporters of Monday holidays is the National Association of Travel Organizations.

TRAVEL STIMULUS

The organization notes that:

"Monday holidays would provide vacationettes which everyone needs to supplement his regular vacation. The long weekends would afford a break in routine which would provide an opportunity for people to engage in their favorite activity—fishing, loafing, visiting, sightseeing, etc.

"Enough of this activity would involve travel to serve as a stimulant to the travel business.

"The new money brought into communities through this travel would stimulate all business.

"The plan would strengthen rather than weaken religious observance of holidays since each 'holiday span' would include a Sunday to make church observance of the holiday possible."

Another supporter of the plan, John R. Park, president of Acme Markets, Inc., Philadelphia, says he feels the suggested change "is highly desirable, not only from the company's standpoint, but also for its employees and customers."

Monday holidays certainly would increase interstate travel. Thousands of travelers would take jets for vacation resorts or visits to friends and relatives.

By train, for instance, a traveler could board a sleeper in Chicago on Friday night and be in Denver or in New York the following morning. He could spend three days, make the return trip on Monday night and be at work on Tuesday morning.

Similarly, regular bus service on super-highways could provide three-day vacations to points far from home.

Most American businesses have settled on the practice of offering employees six paid holidays—Christmas, Thanksgiving, New Year's, Independence Day, Labor Day and Memorial Day. Beyond that there are extreme differences in what individual business firms set aside in the way of paid holidays. Some also give Veterans' Day, for example.

In recent years there is a slight trend toward granting "new" paid holidays for such occasions as Good Friday, Christmas Eve, the day after Thanksgiving and for a "floating" holiday. A floating holiday is described as "a regular holiday deliberately scheduled by a company, sometimes with a union's cooperation [or pressure] to fall on such day as would be most beneficial to the employee." Almost invariably, when used, the floating holiday produces one or more long weekends.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE SURVEY

The National Chamber survey showed, among other things, that businessmen are giving considerable thought to the holiday proposal. It drew the second largest questionnaire response in Chamber history.

Member business firms not only are for uniform Monday holidays but they are prepared to campaign for them. Responses indicated that employees of many of these companies similarly are eager to take advantage of the three-day holidays.

The president of a San Fernando Valley bank comments, "I queried our employees before answering the questions and I was amazed at the spontaneous enthusiasm for the idea. I think on a popular vote there would be a landslide in favor of shifting the holidays to Monday."

Charles A. Smith, chairman of the board of Victory Markets, Inc., Norwich, N. Y., believes the switch would be particularly helpful to anyone dealing in perishable goods. Mr. Smith explains groceries and supermarkets would be able to "clean up" their perishables on a weekend with holidays falling on a Monday.

Food stores try to sell out all their perishables by Saturday closing, since they don't keep well over the weekend. Midweek holidays create problems because perishables have to be removed from display cases on the eve of holidays and returned when the store reopens.

A wholesale grocer in Billings, Mont., favors Mondays off because midweek holidays are a "nightmare." He explains: "Delivery schedules to customers are very difficult to set up in any satisfactory manner when the holiday comes in midweek."

Thomas Butler, chairman of the board of the Grand Union Co., East Paterson, N.J., heartily endorses the proposal.

In his view, midweek holidays disrupt business and are unsatisfactory both to management and employees. "I think uniform Monday holidays would be beneficial in the entire retail field," he observes.

AIRLINES ENTHUSIASTIC

Holmes Brown, American Airlines, Inc., vice president, says "Such three-day weekends combined with the new air fare reductions—one-half youth fares, family fares and excursion fares—will open up new horizons for millions of families all over America, truly making the United States one great neighborhood."

"We heartily endorse the idea and join forces with the National Chamber and all others who will help make this a reality."

A Mamaroneck, N.Y., manufacturer reports his company already "swings" some holidays to create long weekends. "We find that our production actually increases as compared with those occasions where the holiday falls in the middle of the week," he discloses.

Frank Staples, president of the SuCrest Corp., notes that Canada already has adopted uniform Monday holidays and suggests the United States follow suit. "It certainly has my very strong support," he observes. "It would be very beneficial to business."

Another executive, A. W. Baird, vice president of The Travelers Insurance Cos., says his firm seeks constantly to work out three-day holidays when it doesn't interfere with corporate business. "We think we get more mileage out of our employees in this way," he explains.

Travelers, incidentally, abolished Veterans' Day as a holiday in favor of the Friday after Thanksgiving.

Ernest Henderson III, president of the Sheraton Corp. of America, feels considerable lodging business is lost when holidays fall in the middle of the week. "The businessman and the vacationer both stay home and literally the entire week is lost if the holiday falls on either Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday," he observes.

"If holidays were on Monday we could give our customers better service at a lower cost."

OPPONENTS VIEWS

On the other side of the coin, a warehouseman in Rapid City, S. Dak., sees problems emerging from three-day holidays. He says: "We run a public warehouse. Our customers come and give no notice. We cannot plan our output. Carloads and trucks come to our docks at customers' whim. This would peak Tuesdays beyond dock capacity."

To a Salt Lake City businessman the vest-pocket vacation makes sense from an economic standpoint but he fears what it would do to highway travel. Noting that 56 per cent of traffic fatalities occurred on weekends in 1965, he asserts: "To add another day to the weekend seems almost suicidal."

A North Carolina furniture manufacturer minces no words: "We think this makes about as much sense as starting the movement to have all women wear pants and all men to wear dresses. These folks in Washington are changing all our ways of life enough without giving them further ideas."

And this from the partner in an Ohio incubator company, "Why do we have to cook up occasions to celebrate just so we can get

off work? Does it save our conscience? If most of us would work as hard at working as we do to get out of work we might honestly earn the right to a few holidays and our salaries."

A Detroit businessman understandably can't work out a production schedule in advance. Hence, he says, Monday holidays would "make our services 'gang up' from Saturday noon to Tuesday and create a tremendous problem." He operates a funeral home.

Newspaper response to the National Chamber's findings, however, has been generally favorable.

The St. Paul (Minn.) *Pioneer Times*, as one example, comments: "Aside from reluctance to break with old habits, about the only argument against uniform weekend holidays is the fact that they would encourage more automobile travel and this could mean more traffic accidents. Whether this is a sufficient liability to offset the advantages is doubtful."

MEDICARE COVERAGE FOR STATE, MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would allow State and local government employees not otherwise covered by social security to participate in the Federal hospital insurance program on an optional basis.

There are many groups of State and municipal employees such as teachers, firemen, policemen, and others who either are not covered by social security or who do not wish to be covered and therefore do not qualify for medicare benefits. My bill would allow these employees to participate voluntarily in the medicare program as long as they are willing to pay their own way without coming under the social security retirement program.

Since the hospital benefit is a service benefit and the retirement benefit is a wage-related benefit, there is nothing inconsistent with allowing participation in medicare without requiring complete coverage under social security.

I want to emphasize that my bill would leave this question of participation entirely to the choice of the individual.

The enactment of my bill will bring the security of the Federal hospital insurance program to millions of Americans whose only disqualification is the fact that they have dedicated their lives to public service. I ask that prompt consideration and approval be given to this worthwhile expansion of medicare.

THE HOFFA STORY—PART 3

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the last part of "The Hoffa Story" by Paul Healy of the New York Daily News records the final chapter of the Teamsters' leader's rise and fall in union circles. Like the bitter-bit plots of fiction, Hoffa himself laid the groundwork for his own denouement. His advocacy of extreme violence and his inability to cover his complex trail of financial manipulation proved to be his undoing before the relentless pursuit of justice.

Accolades to the New York Daily News and Paul Healy for this brief but forceful chronicle in which justice, at least for the time being, triumphs in a happy ending.

I insert in the RECORD at this point the last article of "The Hoffa Story" series subtitled, "He Fights Right Up to Bell and Loses Judges' Decision":

[From the New York Daily News, Mar. 9, 1967]

THE HOFFA STORY: HE FIGHTS RIGHT UP TO BELL AND LOSES JUDGES' DECISION

(By Paul Healy)

WASHINGTON, March 8.—In early 1963, Jimmy Hoffa seemed to be riding high.

After he was overwhelmingly reelected as Teamster Union president in 1961 for five years, he was the highest paid (\$75,000 a year) and most absolute ruler in the history of American labor. To the hard-core Teamster membership he was what he professed to be—a tough bargainer who concerned himself with bread-and-butter issues and left social reform and philosophizing to such as Walter Reuther.

To the trucking tycoons and others who negotiated contracts with him, Hoffa was an understanding labor leader one could depend on.

Hoffa would not tolerate strikes against contracts by unhappy locals. And sometimes, according to government investigators, he would do a businessman a favor by not enforcing a contract to the limit.

Outwardly, Hoffa gloried in being the "Teamsters' teamster"—the bristling little gamecock who had survived all the efforts of the Senate rackets committee and the brothers Kennedy to drag him down.

But all was not well. Jack Kennedy was in the White House and his brother Bobby was gunning for Hoffa as the nation's No. 1 law enforcer. Bobby had brought his best Hoffa-watchers with him into the Justice Department and had set up a special unit devoted to keeping an eye on him.

The unit was headed by Walter Sheridan, a young ex-FBI agent from Utica, N.Y., who had studied Hoffa's tricks as a member of the rackets committee staff. For five years, Sheridan was to track Hoffa with the dedication of Inspector Javert pursuing Jean Valjean through the sewers of Paris.

Hoffa had displayed his underlying testiness in 1962. He had a temper tantrum when he heard that Teamster organizer Sam Baron had cooperated with the Justice Department. In the Teamsters' lavish headquarters building in Washington, Hoffa had slugged Baron, knocked him down, beaten and kicked him. Baron brought an assault complaint but withdrew it after Teamster witnesses insisted that the 180-pound Hoffa was merely defending himself against Baron, who was 59 and weighed 150 pounds.

ESCAPES CONVICTIONS BUT REMAINS BITTER

But Hoffa was being trailed by Justice Department sleuths down every promising highway in the country.

Two days after Baron fled his assault charges, a federal grand jury in Nashville, Tenn., returned an indictment charging that Hoffa and his pal, Bert Brennan, had been paid \$242,000 by a Detroit trucking firm in violation of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Always, Hoffa had beaten off major convictions. Besides having been freed on a charge of planting a spy on the rackets committee in 1957, he had been acquitted in 1958 of a charge of wiretapping telephones of his subordinates.

A few years later, he had bitterly complained:

"Since 1932, I have been investigated almost on a continuous basis by anybody and everybody. Private investigators hired by employers. Two Congressional committees. The Senate committee. Several grand juries. My wife and I have been 22 years in this damn foot race."

The Nashville trial ended in a hung jury. Hoffa had escaped a misdemeanor conviction under the Taft-Hartley Act which would have hit him with one year in jail at the most. But facing him now was something infinitely worse: Federal Judge William E. Miller ordered a broad investigation of possible jury-tampering during the trial.

In May, 1963, Hoffa and six others were indicted on charges of having tried to bribe jurors in Nashville.

Six months later, before the case came to trial, President Kennedy was assassinated and Hoffa hopefully gloated that Bob Kennedy was now "just another lawyer."

It was cold comfort. His new trial was shifted to Chattanooga. It began in January, 1964, in an atmosphere surcharged with bitterness and melodrama.

GOVERNMENT WITNESS STARTLES HOFFA

Hoffa was jolted when the government produced its star witness, Edward Grady Partin, secretary-treasurer of a Baton Rouge, La., Teamster local. Partin had gone along with a good deal of minor Teamster violence, he said, but he drew the line at assassination.

According to Partin's story, he had been summoned to Teamster headquarters on a trip to Washington in September, 1962, and asked by Hoffa about obtaining plastic explosives to do away with the Attorney General.

"Something has to be done about that little SOB Bobby Kennedy," he quoted Hoffa as saying. "He'll be an easy target, driving around Washington in that convertible with that big black dog."

Horried, Partin went to the government with his story.

After Partin passed an FBI lie detector test, he joined Hoffa at the Nashville trial as a prosecution plant and soon was reporting to Sheridan that Hoffa was busily devising schemes to fix the jury.

When Partin was called to the stand in Chattanooga as the prosecution's surprise witness, Hoffa glowered. Partin was one of the last Teamsters he expected to talk. And he had been fooled by the fact that Partin had taken the Fifth Amendment before the grand jury looking into the jury-tampering charges.

Partin testified that Hoffa had asked him to come to the Nashville trial because "there might be some people he wanted me to talk to."

"He said they were going to get to one juror and try to get to a few scattered jurors and take their chances," the witness said.

In Nashville, Partin related, Hoffa "called me into his room and told me . . . he may want me to pass something for him. He put his hand behind his pocket like that and hit his rear pocket." Partin also quoted Hoffa as saying, "I've \$15,000 or \$20,000 to get to the jury."

Later, Partin testified, he remarked that the conspiracy trial didn't seem to be going well, and Hoffa had replied: "Don't worry about it too much because I have the male colored juror in my hip pocket. One of my colored business agents, Campbell, came in and took care of it."

On March 4, 1964, the jury in the second trial found Hoffa and three pals guilty of obstructing justice in the first trial. When Federal District Judge Frank Wilson fined

Hoffa \$10,000 and sentenced him to eight years, Hoffa shouted that he was innocent.

MILLION DOLLARS WORTH OF TALENT

Fifty-four days later, Hoffa was sitting in a federal courtroom in Chicago facing a 27-count indictment which questioned his integrity as a labor leader. It charged that he and Ben Dranow, a former Minneapolis businessman, and five associates had diverted more than \$1 million from the \$20 million Teamsters pension fund in loans for their own use.

The prosecution produced 20,000 exhibits and 140 witnesses. To fight this massive evidence, Hoffa engaged 10 high-powered defense attorneys. He urged his son Jimmy Jr., then a law student, to come and watch the show because "there's a million dollars worth of legal talent, and it's all on our side."

On the other side was hard-hitting prosecutor William O. Bittman.

The case was extraordinarily complex and lasted for three months. A key element hung on a Hoffa signature. It worked this way:

The government charged that Hoffa had drained off the \$1 million in loans from the Central States Pension Fund (of which he was a trustee) to help bail him out of his Sun Valley, Fla., real estate scheme, which had flopped. Hoffa denied under oath that he had had an interest in the development, contending he had only an option to buy.

Hoffa kept up his denials even when shown a document which had been found in a cook book owned by Henry Lower, president of Sun Valley, after Lower's death. The document stated that Hoffa and an associate, Bert Brennan, had a secret 45 percent financial interest in Sun Valley.

But the agreement was signed "J. R. Hoffa," and Hoffa swore that on a legal document or a letter I would never use "J. R. Hoffa." I would use "James R. Hoffa."

PROSECUTOR DOES A BIT OF MANEUVERING

Bittman dug up a copy of an old apartment lease signed by Hoffa and Calvin Kovens, a codefendant. The signature was "J. R. Hoffa," but the copy was too smudgy for the FBI handwriting experts to identify it positively.

To set up Hoffa, a wise veteran of the witness stand, the prosecutor cross-examined him about the document in such a way as to make him think he was merely trying to establish a relationship between Hoffa and Kovens. When Hoffa blithely dismissed it as nothing more than an apartment lease between them, Bittman suddenly slammed his fist on the rostrum and shouted: "I ask you if your signature isn't 'J. R. Hoffa'?"

Hoffa, momentarily flustered as he saw the point, barked back desperately that a lease was not the kind of "legal document" he meant when he said he never signed "J. R. Hoffa."

The jury voted guilty. Hoffa got five years—to be served after completing his eight-year sentence for jury-tampering.

After 35 years, the courts had truly caught up with Hoffa.

CONGRESSMAN HORTON URGES SELECT COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS AND CONDUCT TO CHECK CONDUCT OF HOUSE MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, in its 3 months of life, the 90th Congress has

marked an hour of concern and of trial for the respect and reputation of this Nation's legislative branch of Government. Since this Congress convened on January 10, the finger of accusation has pointed in many directions on Capitol Hill, as a result of the very serious charges that have been brought against a tiny minority of the 535 legislators of the United States.

It is somehow traditional in the United States to suspect ill deeds or financial gimmickery of electoral officeholders. Thus, when one of our colleagues is shown to have abused the powers and privileges of his office, all of us are marred by such indiscretion and chicanery. We cannot allow the name of this great body to be dragged through the mire of vague suspicion and loss of prestige and respect. Neither can we allow the indiscretions of officeholders and the abuses of power which have occurred to go unchecked. The charge that this House has resorted to scapegoat tactics in cleansing itself cannot be allowed to ring long or true in the ears of the citizens whom we have the privilege to represent in this Chamber.

In recognition of our proven interest in maintaining proposed official behavior of our colleagues and employees, I urge that the House of Representatives establish without delay, a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct which will investigate improprieties and recommend disciplinary measures to the House.

The resolution I am submitting today differs somewhat from those that have been offered by other Members of this body. Many of the resolutions now before the House which provide for the creation of such a select committee provide only that the committee shall "in its discretion" investigate allegations of improper conduct and recommend disciplinary measures. My resolution, in addition to giving the select committee the discretion to investigate or not, contains a mandate whereby the committee must undertake an investigation of any improper conduct or violation of rules which is brought to its attention by a petition signed by a majority of the membership of the House, or by a resolution passed by the House providing for an investigation of specific conduct or misconduct.

By the addition of this mandate, my resolution leaves to the House the power to order an investigation by its appropriate committee of any issues involving standards of conduct which the committee in its discretion has chosen not to act upon. I believe that my resolution satisfies our need for a body which is more than an inactive facade, and which will do a complete and diligent job of maintaining high standards of conduct in this great legislative body, which deserves the highest esteem and respect of all American citizens.

BILL TO MAKE COLLEGE EDUCATION WITHIN THE GRASP OF THOUSANDS OF MIDDLE- TO LOW-INCOME AMERICANS

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentle-

man from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill aimed at bringing the cost of a college education within the grasp of thousands of middle- to low-income Americans. The measure is identical to proposals already introduced by Senators RIBICOFF, TOWER, DOMINICK, and MORTON and similar to the proposal supported by me as early as 1963.

The proposal is aimed at the average American citizen, the people who make up the backbone of this great country.

Our income tax is a graduated tax based on ability to pay. If a person pays a \$1,000 medical bill, he gets some tax relief. If a tornado or other natural disaster causes \$1,000 damage, he gets some tax relief. But if a person pays \$1,000 a year for 4 years to send a son, daughter, or himself to college, he bears that burden with no help from our tax laws.

CREDIT WOULD COVER

The tax credit is based on the first \$1,500 paid for tuition, fees, books, and supplies for any student at an institution of higher education. The credit amounts to 75 percent of the first \$200, 25 percent of the next \$300, and 10 percent of the next \$1,000. The maximum credit allowable for any one student is \$325 per year.

An individual financing more than one student, a parent with two children in college, for example, could get a credit of up to \$325 per year each.

Since the relief is a credit, and not a deduction, it is a subtraction from the tax an individual would otherwise pay after he has computed his tax liability. Each \$1 of credit reduces a person's tax by the same amount, \$1, regardless of the taxpayer's bracket.

The bill also provides that the total amount of credit is reduced by 1 percent of the amount by which a taxpayer's adjusted gross income exceeds \$25,000 per year.

CREDIT COVERS STUDENTS THEMSELVES

The credit is available to anyone paying tuition expenses, including students working to put themselves through school and paying their own expenses. The measure includes students attending accredited postsecondary business, trade, technical, and other vocational schools. Over two-thirds of the benefits would go to families earning less than \$10,000 a year.

AMERICA'S GREATEST RESOURCE

Education is America's greatest national resource. It provides the hope for the future and is responsible for the achievements of the past. This country has prospered because we have relied upon the individual initiative and concern of our citizens at the local level. This proposal would encourage individuals to meet their own educational problems. It would help them to afford the high price of education.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY FUNDS

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MILLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks the President has ordered a partial release of Federal-aid highway funds which had been previously frozen. This release is a step in the right direction. However, there is an immediate need for a complete release of these funds.

In this regard, I wish to submit a letter from the Ohio congressional delegation to the President.

The letter follows:

MARCH 21, 1967.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We, the undersigned Members of the Ohio Congressional Delegation, find it necessary to call to your personal attention a grave crisis which faces the highway construction industry, the State of Ohio and the Nation. This crisis has resulted from the announcement by the Bureau of Public Roads of a reduction in the amount of Federal Aid Highway Funds which can be obligated by Ohio and other states, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967. This situation has been improved only slightly by the recent announcement of a token relaxation in the reduction.

For the past ten years, the Federal Government has prodded the Ohio Highway Department and the highway construction industry to expedite construction of the interstate system. Ohio has been most cooperative in this regard as evidenced by a \$500 Million highway bond issue provided by the voters, \$45 Million of State funds being obligated for advance purchase of interstate highway right-of-way, and \$50 Million of State funds being obligated or loaned to the Federal Government for emergency advance construction of interstate projects.

Ohio has definitely demonstrated that better highways save time, lives, and money. On the other hand, the proposed cutback on highway construction will definitely adversely affect the orderly development of industrial expansion, the cost of transporting and delivering products and commodities, and above all, will take an undetermined number of lives because safe, modern highways will not be available to the traveling public.

Federal highway construction is paid with the proceeds of gasoline and other highway users' taxes which go into a special trust fund. A reduction in the amount of Federal Aid Highway Funds which can be obligated will not reduce the projected Budget deficit since the conventional Budget does not include the operations of the Highway Trust Fund.

It is our sincere hope that you will further rescind the Executive Order which directed this cutback in Federal Aid Highway Funds. We feel that such action would be in the best interest of Ohio and the Nation.

Sincerely,

CLARENCE E. MILLER, MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
FRANCES P. BOLTON, WILLIAM H. HARSHA,
JOHN M. ASHBROOK, WILLIAM H. AYRES,
JACKSON E. BETTS, CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR., SAMUEL L. DEVINE,
MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, WAYNE L. HAYS,
DELBERT L. LATTI, DONALD E. LUKENS,
WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, CHARLES A. MOSHER,
J. WILLIAM STANTON, ROBERT TAFT, JR., CHARLES A. VANIK, CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR., CHALMERS P. WYLIE.

ARE WE ORGANIZED TO FIGHT CRIME?

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 20 of our colleagues joined with me in issuing a statement on the organization of the crime-fighting apparatus of the Federal Government. It represented an effort to raise a number of questions which had not been treated in either the report of the National Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice or in the President's recent message to the Congress on crime.

The report was the product of an informal study group on crime, consisting of Congressman MATHIAS, of Maryland; Congressman MOSHER, of Ohio; Congressman TAFT, of Ohio, and myself.

The four of us were joined on the statement by Congressman MARK ANDREWS, of North Dakota; Congressman ALPHONZO BELL, of California; Congressman DANIEL E. BUTTON, of New York; Congressman JOHN DILLENBACK, of Oregon; Congresswoman FLORENCE DWYER, of New Jersey; Congressman MARVIN ESCH, of Michigan; Congressman SEYMOUR HALPERN, of New York; Congressman THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN, of New York; Congressman WILLIAM MAILLIARD, of California; Congressman CHESTER L. MIZE, of Kansas; Congressman F. BRADFORD MORSE, of Massachusetts; Congressman OGDEN R. REID, of New York; Congressman HOWARD ROBISON, of New York; Congressman PHILIP RUPPE, of Michigan; Congressman HERMAN SCHNEEBELI, of Pennsylvania; Congressman RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, of Pennsylvania; and Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL, of Iowa.

I insert the full text of the statement and its appendices in the body of the RECORD at this point:

ARE WE ORGANIZED TO FIGHT CRIME?

The House Judiciary Committee tomorrow begins hearings on the President's legislative proposals to combat crime. We hope the Committee will expand the scope of its hearings to undertake a full-scale investigation of the adequacy of the Federal Government's organization to fight crime effectively.

The Nation's crime rate continues to rise. There is no simple answer because there is no single cause for crime. A comprehensive answer can only be found in a comprehensive attack on the social and economic problems of the people—in a determined long-range assault on all of our domestic ills. Crime is only a symptom of other failures of our society.

In his State of the Union message, in his more recent special message to Congress, and in the still more recent report of his National Crime Commission the President is launching a new war on crime by this Administration.

We heartily applaud the Administration's new attention to the mounting problem of crime and delinquency in the United States—even though it has been late in coming. The President's Crime message and the Commission report showed Administration awareness that there is some relation between

crime prevention and social behavior, between law enforcement and rehabilitation, between progress and research.

A comprehensive Federal effort to lower the crime rate can be truly effective only with a major reorganization of the Federal Government's departments, agencies and bureaus charged with the task. Today that organization is less than optimum. There must be horizontal coordination at the Federal level and vertical coordination with States and cities.

While this study concentrates on the organization of the Federal responsibilities in the crime area, we should emphasize at the outset that the goal is not more Federal power at the expense of the States and cities. We are unalterably opposed to an omnipotent national police or any moves in that direction.

Quite the contrary, the goal of a Federal reorganization to tackle the crime problem is better to enable State and local law enforcement agencies to get the help and cooperation necessary for them to do their job. The police powers, above all, are the constitutional province of the States—and they should be. Crime is a national problem—but its solution depends primarily on the capacity of the States and local communities to function effectively—and their capacity to get help and cooperation from Washington.

There appears to be little system, little method, little order in the Federal Government's approach to crime. It is a crazy-quilt of departments, bureaus and agencies with competing responsibilities, duplicated staffing, poor communications, and self-defeating jealousies.

As government's concern for the attention to the personal needs of people grew, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare emerged as a central location for all of the government programs to meet those needs. As the pressure of urban problems mounted the new Department of Housing and Urban Affairs was justified as an effort to pull together the relevant Federal agencies and bureaus involved. As the manifold transportation problems and needs of the nation multiplied a new Department of Transportation was proposed to provide better direction and organization to the overall Federal effort.

To combat crime we do not need a new Department, but we badly need a reorganization of the existing structure—to pull together in an orderly way the existing Federal agencies concerned—and to provide a logical framework for giving attention to aspects which today are largely ignored.

Law enforcement, criminal investigation, prison administration, parole, probation, rehabilitation, cooperation with State and local officials, training, research. All of these functions must be brought together in some sensible order. Some are now done in Justice. Some are now done elsewhere. Some are now spread over many departments and agencies. Some are now not done at all.

A Congressional investigation can help provide greater order.

In the attached appendices to this report we have tried to show the organizational chaos within which the Federal Government's crime efforts must now work. But these charts are admittedly incomplete. The reason is simple: no one is able to define with precision where all the authority and all the responsibility of the multitude of programs relating to crime really lie.

Our preliminary study has nonetheless provided ample examples of confusion, competition and duplication to justify many times over our recommendation for a broad-ranging Congressional investigation of the Federal Government's organization to combat crime.

There are over 20 law enforcement or investigative agencies of the Federal Government, ranging from the Federal Bureau of

Investigation to the Fish and Wildlife Service. At least eight separate Cabinet Departments and four other independent agencies are involved, in addition to the Executive Office of the President.

Some of these investigative agencies work in areas which are strictly matters of law enforcement, such as the Bureau of Narcotics, in the Department of the Treasury. Only part of the work of others is law enforcement, such as the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division of the Internal Revenue Service which, among other things, is responsible for policing the National and Federal Firearms Act and the United States Secret Service in the Department of the Treasury which is charged not only with protecting the life of the President but also with enforcing national laws against counterfeiting.

Despite the plethora of Federal law enforcement and security agencies some government offices, such as the Atomic Energy Commission, still turn to private detective agencies, such as the Wackenhut Corporation, for security work. The AEC reportedly pays the Wackenhut Corporation three million dollars a year.

Despite the existence of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Federal Bureau of Investigation is also involved in overseas international intelligence activities, as demonstrated by its involvement in the Dominican crisis in 1965 at the direction of the President.

Almost every Cabinet Department conducts its own personnel security investigations. But there is also a Bureau of Personnel Investigation in the independent Civil Service Commission. On top of that, the FBI annually undertakes some 4,000 personnel security investigations itself on behalf of requesting agencies and departments.

Work on rehabilitation, corrections and delinquency is divided among the Department of Justice, HEW, the Department of Labor, the Executive Office of the President and the Administrative Office of the Courts. Within HEW it is further divided among the Welfare Administration, the Office of Education, the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, and the Public Health Service.

There is no office in the Department of Justice which is concerned with research into the causes of criminal behavior. The Public Health Service, through the National Institute of Mental Health, has extended hundreds of research grants for specific studies in this general area. There is no office which can be found which attempts to coordinate findings of these studies or any other studies into some organized and orderly approach to the problem of crime in the United States. There is not even any office which can be found which attempts to collect all such research products in one place—or even one which lists them.

A reasonably comprehensive approach to organized crime would today require, at the very least, the close cooperation of all the following agencies: The Organized Crime and Racketeering Section of the Criminal Division (Justice Department); the Federal Bureau of Investigation (Justice Department); Immigration and Naturalization Service (Justice Department); Secret Service (Treasury Department); Bureau of Narcotics (Treasury Department); Internal Revenue Service (Treasury Department); Bureau of Chief Postal Inspector (Post Office Department); Labor-Management and Welfare Pension Reports Office (Labor Department).

A comprehensive approach to enforcement of narcotics legislation would today require, at the very least, the close cooperation of all of the following agencies: Federal Bureau of Investigation (Justice Department); Immigration and Naturalization Service (Justice Department); Public Health Service (Department of Health, Education and Welfare); Bureau of Narcotics (Treasury Department); Food and Drug Administration (Department of Health, Education and Welfare); Customs Agency Service (Treasury Department); In-

ternal Revenue Service (Treasury Department); Representation with Interpol (Treasury Department); Bureau of the Chief Postal Inspector (Post Office Department).

Separate schools for training in law enforcement, corrections, rehabilitation or social work in delinquency problems are maintained by the FBI, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Department of the Treasury, the Bureau of Narcotics, etc. Federal grants are extended for training purposes in these fields under the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance (Justice Department), the Welfare Administration (Department of Health, Education and Welfare), the Office of Education (Department of Health, Education and Welfare), the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration (Department of Health, Education and Welfare), the Public Health Service (Department of Health, Education and Welfare). In addition, the Agency for International Development in the Department of State operates its own International Police Academy.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation is organizationally responsible to the Department of Justice, but as recent debates over wire-tapping procedures have shown, the FBI maintains an informal semi-autonomy from Administration regulation.

While all of the previous points relate to confusion within the Federal establishment they contribute also to confusion in Federal-State relations, where lines of authority and responsibility are unclear and where State and local agencies cannot receive knowledgeable guidance as to what Federal aid is available or where the States or local governments should go to get it.

The President's Message on Crime, taken together with the report of his National Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, tend to underscore the disorganization of the Federal anti-crime effort by producing conflicting recommendations, as in the area of wire-tapping and eavesdropping devices.

The President's Message to Congress on Crime of last February 6, 1967, made no effort to resolve any of these severe Federal organization problems. On the contrary, the proposals in the message, regardless of their individual merit, merely impose new structural problems on top of the existing loose structure:

Under the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act a new Office of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance would be established. It would administer the grant and research programs under the Act. These include: 90% grants to States and cities for planning to improve police, courts, and corrections; 60% grants for innovation against street crime, juvenile delinquency, and organized crime; and 100% grants for educational research projects and research institutions. No mention is made of whether this effort is to supplant, replace or coordinate with the existing limited research under the National Institute of Mental Health. Also the proposal does not resolve but compounds the problem of competing agencies offering similar grants in the same field.

The President proposed expansion of the existing training enforcement programs of the Bureau of Narcotics and the Food and Drug Administration. He did not recommend better coordination or consolidation; he did not give attention to the duplication and confusion in existing Federal training programs.

The President directed the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to create a new Information and Education Center on Narcotic and Dangerous Drugs. Nonetheless the Bureau of Narcotics remains in the Treasury Department.

The President directed the Acting Attorney General "to establish a special program to offer State and city officials assistance in setting up effective plans to combat organized crime."

In summary, except for repeating his pro-

posals to transfer the probation office of the Courts to the Justice Department, the President has merely tacked a new wing onto an archaic and rambling house—without comment on organizational needs. We need blueprints for a new house.

Unfortunately, the welcome report of the President's National Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice also provided little guidance as to the optimum organization of the Federal anti-crime effort. In fact, when and if the Commission's extraordinarily broad recommendations are translated into legislation or actual Federal programs they will greatly compound the existing organizational nightmare. This is not to decry the Commission's efforts; it is to emphasize the need for a thorough look at the Federal organizational structure—now.

The Commission did make some valuable suggestions toward the better organization of the anti-crime research efforts. In particular its recommendation for a National Foundation for Criminal Research is exciting.

Its other specific recommendations that relate to the Federal agencies and structure are made without reference to the overall organization problem. The Commission's proposal for a new Federal aid program is apparently the basis for the President's Safe Streets and Crime Control Bill mentioned earlier. The Commission recommends expanding the staffs of the Bureau of Customs, the Bureau of Narcotics, and the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section of the Justice Department. It recommends a permanent joint committee of the Congress on organized crime. It recommends a computerized central Federal intelligence office on organized crime. It recommends a National Criminal Justice Statistics Center. It recommends "greater centralization of the Federal effort" in organized crime.

The question is whether the Administration and the Congress are going to continue to open a new bureau, agency or office every time somebody thinks of something new to do? Or are we, at long last, going to fight crime not with dedication alone, but with some organization too?

A Federal reorganization is long overdue to provide an orderly framework, for the Federal attack on crime. We dare not delay increasing the Federal Government's efforts to combat crime—but neither dare we delay a thorough reconstruction of the Federal responsibilities in the field. Crime waits on no man.

Therefore, we urge the Judiciary Committee to seek comprehensive answers from the Attorney General and its other witnesses to the following questions, each of which is designed to shed light on the needs of a Federal reorganization to fight crime—and the directions which that reorganization might take. The questions have been divided into four major areas: Law Enforcement; Corrections; Research; and Social Programs Relevant to Crime Prevention.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

1. In the present system of over twenty Federal law enforcement and investigative agencies, how extensive is divisive competition, duplication of effort, interagency suspicion and jealousy?

2. What mechanisms now exist to assure adequate cooperation and coordination among the Federal law enforcement and investigative agencies—in sharing files, information, training and personnel?

3. How often are two Federal agencies working on the same case without knowing it?

4. In its investigation of the assassination of President Kennedy, the Warren Commission examined the activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Secret Service and concluded:

"... there was no fully adequate liaison between the two agencies. Indeed, the Commission believes that the liaison between all Federal agencies responsible for Presidential protection should be improved."

What specific steps have been taken to implement this recommendation?

5. Is it appropriate for the Federal Bureau of Investigation to undertake intelligence activities outside of the United States? Does such work facilitate an effective working relationship between the FBI and the Central Intelligence Agency? Does such work detract from the domestic law enforcement and crime detection functions of the FBI?

6. Does it make sense for most executive departments to have their own criminal investigative bureaus?

7. Would it be appropriate to combine all the criminal law enforcement agencies of the Federal Government into a single law enforcement agency within the Department of Justice? Or would the power of such a single agency be too great a threat to democratic government and personal freedoms?

8. Instead of a single giant law enforcement agency, would it be desirable to create at a high level of the Justice Department an Office of the Provost General with the authority to compel appropriate information sharing, coordination and cooperation among the Federal law enforcement and investigative agencies—with the authority to inspect the procedures used by any such agency at any time—and with the authority to encourage, cooperative relations between the Federal agencies and those on the State and local level.

9. Would it be appropriate for the Congress, with the advice of the Attorney General, to develop a code of conduct for the Federal law enforcement agencies and their officers to assure standards of efficiency, inter-agency cooperation, and due process in law enforcement work? Might not such a code be appropriately enforced by an Office of the Provost General, as suggested?

10. In view of the fact that employees and prospective employees of the U.S. Government are not criminals, would it be appropriate to conduct government personnel security investigations through an agency which has no responsibility for criminal investigation or law enforcement?

11. Would not such a separation of functions free the law enforcement agencies to give more undivided attention to combating crime—and at the same time facilitate more cooperative relations between Federal and State and local agencies?

12. Similarly, is the present combination of responsibilities in one agency for both routine criminal investigation and national security work the most effective and efficient way of meeting both responsibilities?

13. In view of the fact that the Federal Bureau of Investigation is the nation's most prestigious and important law enforcement and investigative agency, would it not be appropriate to elevate its organizational status, and that of its personnel, by extending to its Director a rank requiring both presidential appointment and Senate confirmation?

14. Would such a reconsideration of the FBI's organizational status be warranted also by recent instances of apparent differences of opinion between FBI personnel and the Office of the Attorney General?

CORRECTIONS

15. In view of the fact that the Department of Justice is responsible for the arrest and prosecution of offenders of Federal law is it appropriate for the Department also to be responsible for the corrections program? Should the Bureau of Prisons, the Board of Parole and the Office of the Pardon Attorney remain in the Justice Department? Or should they be combined in an independent Corrections Agency?

16. Should the Probation Office, which is now located in the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, be transferred to the Department of Justice, as recommended by the Administration? Or would its work also seem incompatible with the arrest and prosecution functions of the Department of Justice? Might it too be an appropriate office in an independent Corrections Agency? Or should it stay where it is?

17. What mechanisms now exist to assure adequate cooperation and coordination among the Federal corrections agencies—in sharing files, information, training and personnel?

18. Would it not seem appropriate for a single combined Corrections Agency to establish a single combined training school for Federal corrections personnel—and for State and local personnel interested?

RESEARCH

19. Would a new Division of Research in the Department of Justice be an appropriate step forward in an orderly approach to combating crime? Would not such a central research office in the Justice Department be a desirable counter-part to a new National Crime Research Foundation, as proposed by the National Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice?

20. Would it not be valuable for such a new Research Division to collect in one place, for the first time, all the products of the presently disjointed governmental and private research efforts relating to law enforcement—and to provide a system of evaluation and dissemination of their findings?

21. Would it not be valuable for such a new Research Division to provide, for the first time, orderly coordination of a massive program of new and continuing research into the manifold causes of criminal activity in the United States?

22. Would it be appropriate for such a new Research Division to establish its own system of crime statistics reporting and analysis to replace the more limited program now operated by the FBI? Would not crime statistics be more valuable if they were not limited to offenses reported but if they represented correlated figures on arrest, conviction, sentence, parole, probation, rehabilitation and recidivism? Would not a new Research Division in the Justice Department be an appropriate office to create a staff of statisticians and sociologists, adequately trained to compile relevant statistical data and to interpret the data in the most meaningful and useful form?

23. Would not a new Research Division in the Justice Department be an appropriate location for an office to compile all relevant information on Federal programs of aid to the States for law enforcement, crime prevention, and delinquency control—and to provide counsel to the State governments on how to apply for such assistance? Isn't it true that the plethora of existing and recommended programs, administered by a plethora of Federal Departments and agencies, seems to suggest the need for such an office?

24. Would it be appropriate also for a new Research Division of the Justice Department to establish an office to make available to the public accurate information on the effectiveness and safety of the multitude of self-defense and warning devices for personal protection against crime? Is the existing FBI program of public information adequate in this regard?

SOCIAL PROGRAMS RELEVANT TO CRIME PREVENTION

25. What mechanisms now exist to assure that present programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the Department of Labor (and all similar agencies and offices) are making a significant contribution toward crime prevention, proceed from the

same and correct premises of the causes of criminal behavior, and do not duplicate or counter-act each other's efforts?

26. Would it be possible and/or desirable, based upon the work of a new Division of Research in the Department of Justice, to identify a set of criteria which could be used to determine whether any social action program is making at least a minimum contribution to crime prevention?

27. Should there be established in the Department of Justice a Coordinating Council for Crime Prevention Programs, with the authority to test all Federal programs for social, educational, economic and community improvement against minimum criteria for their contribution to crime prevention? Could such a Council, with the authority to recommend changes to the President and the Congress in any Federal program, help to

standardize the Federal Government's thinking on theories of crime prevention, help to assure coordination among the crime prevention components of all Federal social action programs, and help to eliminate the duplication of or harmful competition between programs? Should such a Council include representatives from each of the Federal Departments whose programs the Council would be examining?

APPENDIX I

Organization of the Federal Government for law enforcement and investigation

Department of Justice:
Federal Bureau of Investigation.
Immigration and Naturalization Service.
Office of Law Enforcement Assistance (grants).
Criminal Division.
Internal Security Division.
Office of the Deputy Attorney General:
U.S. attorneys (prosecution).
U.S. marshals.
Office of Criminal Justice.
White House and Executive Office of the President:
Central Intelligence Agency.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:
Food and Drug Administration.
Department of the Treasury:
Office of Special Assistant to the Secretary:
U.S. Secret Service: protection of President and anticounterfeit activities.
Bureau of Narcotics.
Office of Law Enforcement Coordination.
Representative to Interpol.
Bureau of Customs: Customs Agency Service.
Internal Revenue Service:
Intelligence Division.
Inspection Service.
Alcoholic and Tobacco Tax Division (also polices National and Federal Firearms Act).
Other departments:
Department of State:
Division of Investigations: Office of Security.
Department of Defense:
Army:
Office of the Provost Marshal General.
Intelligence Corps Command.
Navy: Office of the Inspector General.
Air Force: Office of the Inspector General.
Department of the Post Office: Bureau of the Chief Postal Inspector.
Department of the Interior:
Fish and Wildlife Service.
National Park Service (Police).
Department of Transportation:
Air Safety Board.
U.S. Coast Guard: Intelligence.
Independent agencies:
Civil Service Commission: Bureau of Personnel Inspections.
Commission on Civil Rights.
Securities and Exchange Commission.
Subversive Activities Control Board.
Judiciary and legislature:
Congress: General Accounting Office.

APPENDIX II

Organization of the Federal Government for delinquency, corrections, and rehabilitation

Department of Justice:
Bureau of Prisons.
Board of Parole.
Office of the Pardon Attorney.
Office of Law Enforcement Assistance (grants).
White House and Executive Office of the President:
The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice.
President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime (Attorney General and Secretaries of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare; coordinating function).
Office of Economic Opportunity (community action programs; Job Corps).
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:
Welfare Administration:
Children's Bureau.
Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development.
Office of Education: Bureau of Adult and Vocational Education (grants to States).
Public Health Service—National Institute of Mental Health:
Hospitals for narcotics addicts.
Grants for research.
Vocational Rehabilitation Administration:
Research and demonstration grants.
National Advisory Council on Correctional Manpower and Training.
Department of the Treasury: None.
Other departments:
Department of Labor:
Manpower Administration: U.S. Employment Service (youth opportunity centers).
Neighborhood Youth Corps.
Independent agencies: None.
Judiciary and legislature:
Judiciary:
Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts: Division of Probation.

APPENDIX III

Organization of the Federal Government for control of organized crime

Department of Justice:
Criminal Division: Organized Crime and Racketeering Section.
Federal Bureau of Investigation.
Immigration and Naturalization Service.
White House and Executive Office of the President: None.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: None.
Department of the Treasury:
Secret Service.
Bureau of Narcotics.
Internal Revenue Service.
Other departments:
Department of the Post Office: Bureau of the Chief Postal Inspector.
Department of Labor: Labor Management and Welfare Pension Reports Offices.
Independent agencies: None.
Judiciary and legislature: None.

APPENDIX IV

Organization of the Federal Government for research and development projects in law enforcement and crime prevention

Department of Justice:
Office of Law Enforcement Assistance: Grants under Law Enforcement Assistance Act.
Criminal Division: Appeals and Research Section (legislative research only).
Office of Criminal Justice: research in rights and treatment of accused and indigent defendants.
Federal Bureau of Investigation:
Laboratory (scientific crime detection).
Uniform Crime Reports (statistics).
Bureau of Prisons: Education project at National Training School for Boys, in cooperation with HEW's Office of Juvenile Delinquency.
White House and Executive Office of the President:
Office of Economic Opportunity.
The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:
Welfare Administration:
Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development. Children's Bureau.
Vocational Rehabilitation Administration:
Grants in rehabilitation of disabled public offenders. National Advisory Council on Correctional Manpower and Training.
Public Health Service:
Office of the Surgeon General (grants in treatment of narcotic addiction).
National Institute of Mental Health:
Grants in social work training, juvenile delinquency, corrections, community services; etc. Addiction Research Center (Lexington Hospital for Narcotics Addicts).
Office of Education:
Grants in elementary and secondary education.
Grants in vocational education.
Department of the Treasury: None.
Other departments:
Department of Labor: Manpower Administration (training needs on correctional institutions).
Independent agencies: None.
Judiciary and legislature:
Congress:
U.S. Senate:
Committee on the Judiciary.
Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.
U.S. House of Representatives:
Committee on the Judiciary.
Committee on Education and Labor.

APPENDIX V

Organization of the Federal Government for control over the use of narcotics

Department of Justice:
Federal Bureau of Investigation.
Immigration and Naturalization Service.
White House and Executive Office of the President: None.
Department of Health, Education and Welfare:
Public Health Service:
National Institute of Mental Health:
Hospitals for narcotics addicts.
Study grants.
Office of Surgeon General (study grants).
Food and Drug Administration.
Department of the Treasury:
Bureau of Narcotics.
Customs Agency Service.
Interpol.
Internal Revenue Service.
Other Departments:
Department of the Post Office: Bureau of the Chief Postal Inspector.
Independent agencies: None.
Judiciary and legislature: None.

APPENDIX VI

Organization of the Federal Government for training of personnel in law enforcement and crime prevention

Department of Justice:
 Federal Bureau of Investigation:
 National Academy (agents and local police officers).
 Agents assigned to local law enforcement training programs.
 Immigration and Naturalization Service:
 Officer Development Center, Los Fresnos, Tex.
 Border Patrol Academy.
 Office of Law Enforcement Assistance: Grants for more effective training under Law Enforcement Assistance Act.
 White House and Executive Office of the President: None.
 Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:
 Welfare Administration: Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development (grants for local programs in research in training in field of youth work).
 Office of Education: Grants to States and higher education for training in social and youth work, and for police training.
 Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—Continued
 Vocational Rehabilitation Administration:
 Grants for social work training centers.
 National Advisory Council on Correctional Manpower and Training.
 Public Health Service:
 Grants to States for training in treatment of narcotics addiction.
 National Institute of Mental Health: Grants for training projects.
 Food and Drug Administration: Local personnel training in drug addiction.
 Department of the Treasury:
 Treasury Enforcement School.
 Bureau of Narcotics:
 Training School.
 Local personnel training in drug addiction.
 Other departments:
 Department of State:
 Agency for International Development: International Police Academy.
 Independent agencies: None.
 Judiciary and legislature:
 Judiciary:
 Judicial Conference: Committee on Probation (develop national program for training of probation officers).

APPENDIX VII

Organization of the Federal Government for juvenile delinquency

Department of Justice:
 Federal Bureau of Investigation.
 Bureau of Prisons.
 Office of Law Enforcement assistance (grants).
 White House and Executive Office of the President:
 President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime.
 Office of Economic Opportunity (Community Action; Job Corps).
 White House Conference on Children and youth.
 Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:
 Welfare Administration:
 Children's Bureau.
 Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development.
 Office of Education: Division of Vocational and Technical Education.

FEDERAL CHARTERS FOR MUTUAL SAVINGS BANKS

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which would correct a long-standing inequity and grant Federal charters to mutual savings banks.

I say inequity because, at the present time, mutual savings banks are exclusively State chartered and thus are denied the proven benefits of the dual system of Federal-State chartering and supervision long available to commercial banks, savings and loan associations, and credit unions. As a result of this difference, mutual savings banks have sometimes been thwarted by outmoded State regulations and have been placed at a disadvantage with respect to their competitors.

Mutual savings banks, now solely State chartered, have compiled an excellent record of soundness, while effectively serving the public's thrift and long-term financial needs.

Their record in my own State, New Hampshire, is typical. There, there are now 38 mutual savings banks, which have attracted more savings and supplied more mortgage credit than all other types of institutions combined. They accounted for more than 70 percent of total savings held by deposit-type institutions in my State at the end of 1966. Mutual savings banks represented 72 percent of the total volume of mortgage loans held at that time by all New Hampshire financial institutions, and this was a gain of 10 percent in just the past 10 years.

In my own hometown of New London, N.H., I was an organizing officer and am a director of a State-chartered trust company, the New London Trust Co., which we founded 9 years ago, and has both a commercial and savings department. I have thus seen mutual savings banks in operation as competitors, and this experience has convinced me that the public is better served where both types of banks exist. Competition is good for this industry as in others. The functions of each type of banking institution tend to complement and supplement the services of others.

The indispensable economic role performed by mutual savings banks in New Hampshire, which I have outlined briefly, should be extended to other States as well. I feel that this extension can best

APPENDIX VII—Continued

Organization of the Federal Government for juvenile delinquency—Continued

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—Continued
 Vocational Rehabilitation Administration (grants).
 Public Health Service:
 National Institute of Mental Health:
 Narcotics hospitals.
 Research.
 Department of Treasury: Bureau of Narcotics.
 Other departments:
 Department of Labor:
 Manpower Administration:
 U.S. Employment Service (youth opportunity centers).
 Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training.
 Neighborhood Youth Corps.
 Department of the Interior:
 Bureau of Indian Affairs: Juvenile officers.
 Independent agencies: None.
 Judiciary and legislature:
 Judiciary:
 Administrative Office of U.S. Courts: Department of Probation (juvenile probation officers).

APPENDIX VIII

Organization of the Federal Government for crime in the District of Columbia (in addition to all obviously relevant Federal bureaus and agencies)

Department of Justice:
 U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia: Criminal cases in district court; lesser crimes.
 Bureau of Prisons: National Training School for Boys.
 White House and Executive Office of the President:
 Office of Economic Opportunity: United Planning Organization.
 Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: None.
 Department of the Treasury:
 U.S. Secret Service: White House Police Force.
 Other departments:
 Department of the Interior: National Park Service (U.S. Park Police).
 Independent agencies: None.
 Judiciary and legislature:
 Congress:
 U.S. Capitol Police (guard Capitol and congressional buildings).
 District of Columbia:
 District Commission on Public Safety (Metropolitan Police).
 Corporation Counsel (municipal ordinance and regulations violations; certain misdemeanors).
 District Department of Correction (administers 4 penal institutions).
 Department of Public Welfare (juvenile institutions).
 Public Health Department (Diagnostic and Rehabilitation Service).
 Recreation Department (roving leaders; special programs for gangs and youth).
 Commissioner's Youth Council (volunteer programs to interest youth in constructive activities, aiding potential delinquents and families).

be accomplished by permitting mutual savings banks to be organized under Federal charter as are other similar type financial institutions.

This matter has been before the Congress for several years. In 1963, during hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency in the 88th Congress, I testified in behalf of similar legislation. At that time, I pointed out the support such Federal chartering had won from the Commission on Money and Credit and from the President's Committee on Financial Institutions, composed of the heads of all key Federal agencies.

Today I renew this plea on behalf of mutual savings banks and ask that a favorable decision be reached on their status.

TO AID THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today that would

require all public buildings constructed with Federal funds to be designed and constructed so as to be accessible to the physically handicapped.

Time and again persons with physical handicaps have proven that they can lead normal, constructive lives, and have become productive members of our society. But for many of them, a most difficult part of their daily routine is getting to and from their place of employment. It seems incongruous that, in an age where automobiles have been built that can be easily handled by the physically handicapped, these same persons should encounter their most severe difficulties after they reach their building of employment.

Discrimination for many causes has been eliminated in the Federal service. Discrimination against the handicapped, by reason of lack of accessibility to buildings built in whole or in part with Federal funds, should also be ended.

At the present time, the General Services Administration follows guidelines for construction designed to ease this problem. But many non-Federal buildings constructed with Federal assistance do not follow these same guidelines and thus are not accessible to the physically handicapped.

Several States already have legislation similar to what I am proposing. It is only fitting that the Federal Government, which has taken the lead in so many similar programs, should catch up in this one and insure equality for the physically handicapped.

TO SET ASIDE WEEK TO HONOR NATIONAL SCHOOL SAFETY PATROL MEMBERS

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, since the early 1920's the death rate from auto accidents in most age groups has doubled. But in one age group, school-age children, it has dropped by nearly 50 percent.

During this time, one of the major contributing factors in this dramatic decrease has been the fine work of the school safety patrol members throughout the Nation.

It is only fitting that we seek to call attention to this feat by establishing permanently a week to be set aside as National School Safety Patrol Week, and I have today entered legislation which would do this. It would permanently designate the second week of May for this purpose, serving as a constant reminder of the good work done in the past and the necessity for vigilance to maintain this record.

During the more than 40 years since the school safety patrol program was established, more than 16 million Americans have served as members. Cur-

rently, there are more than 900,000 members serving the cause of traffic safety at 40,000 schools in all 50 States, helping to protect our 19 million school-children.

In this program, a cooperative venture sponsored jointly by the American Automobile Association's motor clubs, local school systems, and police departments and associations, increasing attention has been paid to the vital field of traffic accident prevention. It is a program that goes far deeper than the smiling youngster on the street corner with the familiar white belt.

I urge that this resolution, which would recognize both the accomplishments and needs of this important program, be enacted.

BILL TO GRANT ASYLUM

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, as a first step toward restoring America's great tradition as a sanctuary for all those fleeing from tyranny I today introduced a bill to grant asylum to Svetlana Stalina. This woman, of course, is the daughter of Russia's bloodiest tyrant but to my knowledge no one has charged that she is either a criminal or a political troublemaker. Under the longstanding and halloved policy of the United States she therefore should have been granted immediately her request for asylum in this country.

Our Government has acknowledged that Mrs. Stalina did indeed request asylum. Our Government is silent, however, on the response it made to her request. The fact that she is not in this country but instead secreted away in Switzerland is answer enough.

The United States very clearly turned down her request. To me it was a disgraceful action. It was political expediency, plain and simple. She was denied refuge in this country out of concern for what the Soviet Government might think.

This means that asylum now may be denied in order to protect that flimsy thing called detente. The United States appears to be so obsessed with placating the Soviet dictatorship that it has turned away a woman seeking safety. I cannot believe that this is what the American people really want. Better late than never the United States must reverse this decision and do so quickly. Accordingly I call upon the leaders of the House and Senate to expedite consideration of this bill.

Following is the text of my bill:

A bill to grant asylum to Svetlana Stalina.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of the Immigration and Nationality Act or any other provision of law, Svetlana Stalina shall, upon application at any consular office of the

United States, be granted a visa and admitted to the United States for a temporary period as a nonimmigrant, or for permanent residence, in accordance with the terms of her application for admission.

Mr. Speaker, in refusing Mrs. Stalina's plea America passed up a great opportunity to reveal the bankruptcy of Communist life.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 40 on H.R. 2068, a bill entitled "Veterans Pension and Readjustment Assistance Act of 1967," and rollcall No. 41 on H.R. 2513, having to do with the establishment of a Commission on National Observances and Holidays, I was unavoidably absent to attend a family funeral in Kentucky.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on both bills and ask that the RECORD so indicate.

ANNIVERSARY OF HUNGARIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague Representative EDNA KELLY, Democrat of New York, who is chairman of the Europe Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, has throughout her career in the House expressed lasting interest in the tragic enslavement which communism has maintained over the peoples of Eastern Europe. On Sunday, March 12, Mrs. KELLY addressed the American Hungarian Federation of the State of New York, in the Assembly Hall at Hunter College, on the anniversary of Hungarian independence.

Her devotion to the well-being and right of self-determination of the people of Eastern Europe is evidenced in her dramatic address.

Recognizing as I do the confusion that exists in the State Department over relations and agreements with Communist governments and recognizing the very proper prominence Mrs. KELLY enjoys as an especially knowledgeable member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee I am pleased to insert herein her remarks of March 12:

ANNIVERSARY OF HUNGARIAN INDEPENDENCE
(Speech before American Hungarian Federation of the State of New York, Mar. 12, 1967, Assembly Hall, Hunter College)

Honorable guests, members of the clergy, my friends, ladies and gentlemen, I am deep-

ly humbled and most grateful for the kind invitation which you have bestowed on me this afternoon. It is a pleasure to be with you on this memorable anniversary of Hungarian independence.

We seem to have come upon a time when the condemnation of ruthless imperialism is directed only at the nations of the west; when indeed it is considered intellectually stylish to flay the forces of freedom and lament the disabilities of democracy. Why is it that we fail so often to take cognizance of the continuing deprivation of human rights by the forces of Red aggression? Today, there are over fifty thousand Soviet troops illegally occupying Hungary, and an imposed Communist dictatorship is in control. The country's borders are garnished with minefields, barbed wire, and steel watchtowers. This last barrier to freedom serves as a brutal and poignant reminder of what everyone here today knows only too well! Hungary today is a despotic police state. A number of years ago, the United Nations passed several resolutions calling for the immediate withdrawal of Soviet forces from Hungarian territory. Yet it is quite evident that nothing was done to implement them. It will surprise no one to learn that this resolution was heartily supported by the Soviet delegation to the U.N., despite the fact that the Communist violate its precepts heedlessly every day throughout the world.

The Hungarian people have never recoiled from duty. The great cause which spurred them to revolt in 1848 and again in 1956 has in no measure been compromised. And it must not by any of us who envision a world of peace and international harmony, based on the principles of sovereignty and self-determination. For Hungarians, the noble search for autonomy has gone on for close to one thousand years. It was a moment of incredible bravery and much glory when, on March 15, 1848, the Hungarians were able to seize their liberty after almost a century and a half of suppression under the Hapsburg monarchy.

Many parallels have been drawn between the dramatic events of 1848 and those occurring in 1956. There is little doubt that the heritage of the young, liberal generation in the earlier insurrection helped ignite the fires of rebellion and resistance more than a century later.

Is there anyone here today who cannot vividly recall the tragic chain of events that began so hopefully on October 23? The revolt, which began as a peaceful student demonstration in support of demands for relaxation of Stalinist terror, terminated in a carnage and bloodbath so savage as to defy accurate description. Who can forget the desperate cry of radio Budapest before it was forced to leave the air: "Help Hungary . . . help us! . . . help us!" The atrocious manner in which Soviet troops crushed the aspirations of an heroic people has earned for them a badge of infamy which will surely not be easily forgotten.

I would like at this point to quote from the 1957 report of the special study mission to Europe on policy toward the satellite nations in which I, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, wrote as follows: "The Hungarian revolution which broke out October 23 was catastrophic in nature and caught the free world totally unprepared. The nature of its rapid development likewise came as a surprise." The report further states, "the failure of the free world and of the United Nations under the leadership of the United States to take the positive action expected and impliedly promised in Hungary constitutes, in the judgment of the study mission, the lost opportunity of our generation."

It was during the October days of liberation that Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty enjoyed his fleeting breath of freedom. This great christian leader has from the beginning

stood as a pre-eminent symbol of steadfast resistance to atheistic communism. In 1948, the Roman Catholic Church, under the leadership of the Cardinal Primate, refused to accept the nationalization of their numerous church schools. The government forcibly imposed its will upon the church and the cardinal, in a travesty of justice, was sentenced to life imprisonment for alleged conspiracy against the state. He remained a Communist prisoner until 1956, when, at the height of the revolution, he was released by patriots and brought in triumph to Budapest. His liberation endured for little more than a hundred hours. On November fourth, he was forced to flee for his life when the Nagy Government fell under the Soviet intervention. He found refuge within the walls of the American legation in Budapest, and to this day remains tragically isolated from the more than eight million Hungarian people to whom he is spiritual adviser. In his tiny apartment on the third floor of the American legation, he reads and writes and prays for the eventual liberation of his people from the oppressive throes of tyranny. Our hearts are with him tonight.

Our own beloved Francis Cardinal Spellman was recently brought to task for his forceful condemnation of the depravity and immorality of Communist ambitions in southeast Asia. Cardinal Spellman understands the nature of Red brutality. He was among the first to express his shocked indignation at the senseless cruelty inflicted upon Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty in 1948. He correctly described the life sentence imposed upon his colleague as "prolonged murder."

Cardinal Mindszenty and Cardinal Spellman have much in common. Both have devoutly served in the priesthood for more than half a century. Both have exercised profound influence upon the ecclesiastical and secular affairs of their countries. And both are untiring and outspoken enemies of Communist oppression. Cardinal Spellman once remarked that "it is an honorable and heroic thing to fight for those ideals and principles we account worthy of preservation." It is to the ideals of freedom and christianity that these two great servants of God have devoted their lives.

Today, it is fitting that we rededicate our lives to the cause for which so much blood was shed, and so much suffering endured, in the courageous Hungarian uprisings of 1948 and 1956. Truly, the whole free world has been deeply inspired by the heroic endeavors undertaken by the Magyar people to liberate their land from the bonds of slavery. In our world there is great turmoil and trouble. And if there is ever to be an enduring peace, it will not be until every nation and every man be allowed to live in the freedom for which Hungarians have struggled so valiantly and so long.

Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I especially recommend to the Members thoughtful consideration of this heartwarming and timely address of our distinguished colleague. She understands the human suffering of people under communism. She recognizes the practical realities of the day and the need to have implemented a foreign policy that will help bring about a world which will truly be free and peaceful.

RECOGNITION FOR HISTORIC AVIATION ACHIEVEMENTS OF AVIATRIXES AMELIA EARHART AND JOAN MERRIAM SMITH

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MIZE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor today to join with the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] and other colleagues in the introduction of resolutions to give official recognition to the achievements in aviation recorded by Amelia Earhart and Joan Merriam Smith.

Our resolutions ask that Congress set May 12 each year as Amelia Earhart-Joan Merriam Aviation Day. They also recommend to the President that he award the Presidential Medal of Freedom to each of the aviatrixes and furthermore, that consideration be given by the Postmaster General to the issuance of a commemorative airmail stamp in honor of Joan Merriam's world flight under the theme, "World Friendship via Aviation."

Mr. Speaker, the achievements of these two flyers are well known, but they bear repeating. Amelia Earhart of Atchison, Kans., which is also my hometown, is America's first and most renowned aviatrix. Her record flights include: the first person to fly from Hawaii to the U.S. mainland; first person to fly the Atlantic Ocean twice; first person to fly nonstop from Mexico City to Newark, N.J.; the first woman to fly solo across the Atlantic Ocean; the first woman to fly both ways across the United States; and the first woman to be awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross by the Congress in 1932. She was also the winner of aviation's highest award, the Harmon-International Aviation Trophy in 1932, 1933 and 1934.

Joan Merriam Smith flew the 1937 Earhart equator route between March 17 and May 12, 1964, and became the first person to fly solo around the world at the equator. She was also the first woman to fly a twin-engine plane around the world; and for this flight, she was awarded, posthumously, the 1965 Harmon International Aviation Trophy.

These records speak for themselves. The distinguished flyers who set them deserve the additional recognition the Congress can give to them by adopting the resolutions being offered today. Youngsters today and in the future will be inspired by the pioneering spirit of these courageous women. They need to know more about the Amelia Earhart saga and the Joan Merriam Smith story. They need to know why both of these ladies are great Americans and why they will go down in history.

Moreover, they need to know about their courage—the type of rare courage which Amelia Earhart exemplified and to which she gave lasting testimony in her poem, which I respectfully ask each Member to read:

COURAGE

(By Amelia Earhart)

Courage is the price that Life exacts for granting peace.

The soul that knows it not

Knows no release from little things:

Knows not the livid loneliness of fear,

Nor mountain heights where bitter joy can

hear

The sound of wings.

How can life grant us boon of living,
compensate
For dull gray ugliness and pregnant hate
Unless we dare
The soul's dominion? Each time we make
a choice, we pay
With courage to behold the restless day.
And count it fair.

RECOGNITION FOR HISTORIC AVIATION ACHIEVEMENTS OF AVIATRIXES AMELIA EARHART AND JOAN MERRIAM SMITH

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a resolution which I have introduced with a number of my distinguished colleagues to designate May 12 of each year Amelia Earhart-Joan Merriam Smith Aviation Day, in honor of these two American aviatrixes.

It is certainly unnecessary to extol the feats of Amelia Earhart. We are all familiar with the activities of this courageous aviation pioneer. Miss Earhart found a dedicated follower in Joan Merriam Smith.

Joan Merriam Smith dreamed from early childhood of flying alone around the world along the same route charted by Amelia Earhart. As she explained in a Saturday Evening Post article:

I had had the dream for years; first to fly an airplane, then to fly one as she did. When I was in high school, I would tell my friends and classmates that someday I was going to fly around the world just like Amelia Earhart. Everybody just laughed. They knew I was a baseball-playing tomboy, and this was a tomboy fantasy. But I knew that since Amelia disappeared in 1937, no other woman had ever attempted to fly around the world. This only heightened my ambition to be the first one. On March 17, 27 years to the day after Amelia took off from Oakland on her round-the-world attempt, I sat at the controls of my own small plane at the same Oakland airport and pointed eastward along the same 27,000-mile route she had planned so long ago. In some strange way I felt I was fulfilling not only my lifelong dream but Amelia's dream too.

And so she began the culmination of this long-cherished ambition. From March 17 to May 12, 1964, she flew a total of 27,750 miles during which time she crossed the equator four times. Again, I think Mrs. Smith best sets forth her feelings in a letter to Ruth Deerman, president of the Ninety-Nines, an international organization of women pilots:

I have paid a very high price to fly the Amelia Earhart route. It has been a ten-year desire and obsession to fly the Amelia Earhart path . . . what I consider the roughest route in the world over terrain and conditions I wish not to travel again. Amelia and Noonan were certainly brave and courageous to fly this trip in the days of no aids or maps. I hope I will be able to complete this ten-year ambition safely and will find the greatest reward in being only the second woman to fly the globe.

The words and deeds of this brave young American certainly stand out as a shining example of the kind of undaunted pioneer who did not fear to push onward into the unexplored wilderness ahead and who contributed so much to making our Nation what it is today.

We were stunned in 1965 when the 28-year-old aviatrix was killed in a plane crash in southern California. Ironically, just 5 weeks earlier she had escaped unharmed from a crash of her own Apache aircraft. This was certainly a most tragic loss for aviation and the Nation.

Joan Merriam Smith was posthumously awarded the 1965 Harmon Trophy in recognition of her achievement in flying the Amelia Earhart route. I hope that my colleagues will give rapid approval to this resolution we are introducing today honoring Amelia Earhart and Joan Merriam Smith and proclaiming the cause of world friendship through aviation.

INTERNATIONAL DAY FOR THE ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, today is officially International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, as proclaimed by the United Nations General Assembly in a resolution adopted on October 26, 1966.

This commemoration should remind us of the pending International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. This treaty is a product of multilateral negotiation, undertaken within the United Nations organization. The United States, throughout these negotiations, played a major role in drafting the convention.

Mr. Speaker, I have on previous occasions underscored the rather shabby treatment we have bestowed upon a host of human rights agreements which, paradoxically, are thoroughly imbued with our own concepts and have been substantially influenced by our own participation in the negotiation process. I have no doubt that the timidity which the Executive has shown, in delaying ratification, stems from the belief that the Congress is apt to be unfriendly, if not openly hostile.

However, I have noticed over the years that when the executive wants something badly enough, its persuasive techniques are likely to be successful, especially when both Houses are controlled by the President's party. To our great shame, there has been no convincing effort exerted by the executive branch in behalf of the human rights treaties.

The World Convention on Racial Discrimination has still not been referred to the Senate. It is holed up somewhere in the depths of Foggy Bottom, collecting dust. To my knowledge, there has been no consultation with concerned parties in the other body, who are charged with consenting to treaties to which this Nation is a party. Moreover, I must in-

sist that the Government was derelict in not attempting to maintain a continuing liaison with the legislative branch when we all know that once the painfully drawn out process of negotiation is finished, the Senate will have the last word.

Our inaction, as far as this convention is concerned, takes on a double meaning today. This is also the seventh anniversary of the Sharpeville, South Africa, violence which resulted from mass demonstrations against apartheid in that unhappy land. On March 21, 1960, tens of thousands of Africans participated in a work boycott to protest various laws, such as the restriction on movement and employment. At Sharpeville, police fired on the demonstrators, killing 68 persons and wounding nearly 200 others.

The iniquity of the system of apartheid was dramatically and tragically evidenced by these protests, held on March 21, 1960.

Last year, the Subcommittee on Africa of the Foreign Affairs Committee held hearings on the subject of U.S. policy toward South Africa. It was my hope that the recommendations voiced at that time would be considered by the administration in attempting to forge a more realistic and principled policy toward South Africa. There is little, if any, evidence that this has happened.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution of the U.N. General Assembly, and the incident at Sharpeville, will serve as a further impetus to rectify this country's official posture on the subject of human rights.

For the information of my colleagues, I am inserting at this point in the RECORD the United Nations resolution referred to earlier:

[On the report of the Third Committee (A/6484)]

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

(Twenty-first session, Agenda item 57)

2142 (XXI). *Elimination of all forms of racial discrimination*

The General Assembly, Recalling its resolutions 1905 (XVIII) of 20 November 1963 and 2017 (XX) of 1 November 1965 on measures to implement the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination,

Recalling also its resolution 2106 A (XX) of 21 December 1965, in which it adopted and opened for signature the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination,

Noting the information in the report of the Secretary-General,¹ furnished in accordance with Economic and Social Council resolution 1076 (XXXIX) of 28 July 1965 and General Assembly resolution 2017 (XX) on the action taken by Member States, the United Nations, the specialized agencies and regional inter-governmental organizations directed towards the implementation of the Declaration,

Noting also that a seminar on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination is to be held, under the programme of advisory services in the field of human rights, in 1968,

Noting further that the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities is undertaking a special study of racial discrimination in the political, economic, social and cultural fields, and has

¹ E/4174 and Add.1-2, Add.2/Corr.1 and Add.3-9. 66-26806.

already appointed a Special Rapporteur for that purpose.

Reaffirming that racial discrimination and apartheid are denials of human rights and fundamental freedoms and of justice and are offences against human dignity.

Recognizing that racial discrimination and apartheid, wherever they are practised, constitute a serious impediment to economic and social development and are obstacles to international co-operation and peace.

Deeply concerned that racial discrimination and apartheid, despite the decisive condemnation of them by the United Nations, continue to exist in some countries and territories.

Convinced of the urgent necessity of further measures to attain the goal of complete elimination of all forms of racial discrimination and apartheid.

1. *Condemns*, wherever they exist, all policies and practices of apartheid, racial discrimination and segregation, including the practices of discrimination inherent in colonialism;

2. *Reiterates* that such policies and practices on the part of any Member State are incompatible with the obligations assumed by it under the Charter of the United Nations;

3. *Calls again upon* all States in which racial discrimination or apartheid is practised to comply speedily and faithfully with the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and with the above-mentioned resolutions and all other pertinent resolutions of the General Assembly, and to take all necessary steps, including legislative measures, for this purpose;

4. *Calls upon* all eligible States without delay to sign and ratify or to accede to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination;

5. *Calls upon* Member States which have not already done so to initiate appropriate programmes of action to eliminate racial discrimination and apartheid, including in particular the promotion of equal opportunities for educational and vocational training, and guarantees for the enjoyment, without distinction on the grounds of race, colour or ethnic origin, of basic human rights such as the rights to vote, to equality in the administration of justice, to equal economic opportunities and to equal access to social services;

6. *Appeals* to Member States that, in combating discriminatory practices, education and culture should be directed, and mass media and literary creation should be encouraged, towards removing the prejudices and erroneous beliefs, such as the belief in the superiority of one race over another, which incite such practices;

7. *Requests* the Member States which have not yet replied to the Secretary-General's inquiry as to the measures they have taken to implement the Declaration to do so without delay;

8. *Proclaims* 21 March as International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination;

9. *Requests* the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its twenty-second session a report on the implementation of the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, and on the implementation of the provisions of the present resolution;

10. *Decides* to place this item on the provisional agenda of its twenty-second session.

HALPERN BILLS WOULD HELP FILL THE GAP IN AID TO CHILDREN

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to close the gap between what

we are doing for the needs of the Nation's children, and what we should do.

We concern ourselves every day with the nuclear gap, the space gap, the credibility gap, and an assorted clutch of gaps of various kinds. But, at the same time, we lag far behind other nations in our services to, and for, the children who will be the fathers, mothers, mayors, Congressmen, and Presidents—the future United States of America.

In his message to the Congress last February 8, the President of the United States put the problem well, in these words:

A wealthy and abundant America lags behind other modern nations in training qualified persons to work with children.

These workers are badly needed—not only for poor children, but for all children. We need experts and new professionals in child care. We need more pre-school teachers, social workers, librarians and nurses.

New training efforts must be supported—for day care counselors, parent-advisers and health-visitors. We must train workers capable of helping children in neighborhood centers, in health clinics, in playgrounds and in child welfare agencies. Others must be prepared to support the teacher in the school and the mother in the home.

Substantial increases in Federal financial assistance are required to make these vitally necessary aims possible. For that reason, I am introducing today a bill to pay to States 75 percent of their salary and training costs for child welfare personnel already employed, or to be hired. The President asked for this assistance, and it is a just request which should be speedily granted.

But my bill, which is similar to the excellent far-reaching legislation introduced earlier by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BURKE] would go beyond the point of help with salaries and training.

States must also be encouraged to strengthen and expand their aid to voluntary agencies upon which they depend for foster care programs, and greater efforts must be made to prevent families from breaking up, by providing services in the home.

My bill would provide from 50 to 83 percent of all State and local child welfare expenditures, including salaries and training. The least wealthy States would receive the largest share of Federal assistance.

This bill would also encourage States to place greater stress on developing new and experimental areas of child welfare services. It would encourage efforts toward pioneering and discovery through Federal project grants.

For example, with such financial assistance, States would find it possible to experiment with new and untried ideas in small areas, to prove them and perfect them before instituting them on a statewide basis.

This bill would defeat its own purposes if States used the Federal funds to replace State expenditures, rather than to expand their programs. As a safeguard against such an eventuality, my bill would require that State and locality shares of expenditures may not be less than they were during the year ending June 30, 1966.

Each State applying for Federal funds would be required to present a plan for a

comprehensive child welfare program. Such plans have to meet the requirements established by the 1962 amendments to the Social Security Act, Part IV. Included among these is the provision that the same services must be provided for children in all counties of the State.

Certainly, the future of our future citizens is as important as getting to the moon or photographing Mars. We must lose no time in providing critically needed funds for these basic services to children.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 40 on H.R. 2068 concerning the Veterans' Pension and Readjustment Assistance Act of 1967, I was unavoidably absent as a result of official business in my district. Had I been present on this rollcall I would have voted "aye."

PROTECTION FOR CHILDREN

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a public spirited citizen in my district wrote to me recently to express her concern about a practice among certain merchandisers to mail for advertising purposes unsolicited drug products and other items that are a potential hazard to children should they inadvertently fall into their hands.

The lady who wrote related an incident in her letter involving two small neighborhood children who decided to inspect the contents of her mailbox on the very day that the mailman had delivered a package of unsolicited sample throat lozenges.

When the lady came upon the children they were unwrapping the lozenges in happy anticipation of eating "candy."

Angered by the potential harm that could have been done, she wrote to the manufacturer who had sent the lozenges to complain. A company official wrote back saying that the dosage in the lozenges was too small to be harmful.

Are they not aware, asked the lady in a subsequent letter to me, that any drug can cause serious and sometimes fatal allergic reactions in certain people?

Incidents similar to the one recounted to me by my constituent have doubtless been repeated countless times across the country. This one had a happy ending because the children were discovered in time. How many such incidents, however, may have had more serious consequences?

While investigating what the Congress might do in this area, I discovered that our distinguished colleague from California [Mr. MOSS], had introduced H.R. 910 on the first day of this session which would regulate the mailing of potentially harmful sample items. I am today introducing a bill identical to the one being sponsored by Congressman Moss.

The bill would prohibit the mailing of unsolicited sample drugs, devices, pesticide chemicals, razor blades and such other items as the Postmaster General determines are potentially physically harmful to minor children. Mailing of these items from the manufacturer or dealer to licensed physicians, surgeons, dentists, pharmacists, druggists, cosmetologists, barbers and veterinarians would, of course, be exempted from the prohibition.

THE HONORABLE DOMINICK V. DANIELS—HONORARY IRISHMAN

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, for 18 years I had the great honor of representing the western part of Hudson County, N.J., and surely there are no better people for a Congressman to represent than the wonderful people who live in Harrison, Kearny, and East Newark. Thus, it was with great reluctance that I said goodbye to these fine people when reapportionment caused these three towns to be taken from the 10th District and incorporated within the boundaries of the 14th District. The only consolation was that I was leaving my friends in good hands because I knew the kind of job that their new Congressman, DOMINICK DANIELS, has been doing for the people of the 14th District.

DOMINICK DANIELS has a warm and wonderful personality and it does not surprise me that the people of the three west Hudson towns have taken their Congressman into their hearts.

Last Saturday night the Irish-American Association of Kearny named our friend an "honorary Irishman"—perhaps the highest honor that the friendly Celts in west Hudson can bestow upon their new Representative, but they can be very sure that the new Irishman does not take the honor lightly. Just today, for example, the 14th District Irish lawmaker promised to take me to lunch in the House Restaurant on the next occasion when they have corned beef and cabbage on the menu.

Having known Mayor Healey and the other moving spirits behind the Irish-American Association of Kearny for many years, I have only one favor to ask. Can we have him back just for next Columbus Day?

NEED TO REVISE SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW—XXXVI

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, supporters of national service programs envision plans whereby up to a million or more young men will be participating in nonmilitary activities. Do they, however, realize what the financial commitment will have to be to support such programs? The training of a Peace Corpsman is about \$8,000. The original training cost of a Job Corpsman was \$9,935. Now it has been reduced to \$7,000. But training costs are only part of the picture. There are medical expenses, salaries for the young men, room and board, and the greatest amount of money going for the funding of the projects themselves. How many more billions of dollars will be added to the Federal budget to support this involuntary servitude and the enormous bureaucracy it will create to administer its operations?

Surely, instead of relying on coerced "volunteers," more effective work can be done, and at a smaller financial cost, by highly motivated volunteers.

INTERNATIONAL DAY FOR THE ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, today is March 21, 1967. It marks the coming of spring after a long, hard winter. It also marks International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, as proclaimed by the U.N. General Assembly in a resolution adopted last October.

The date was chosen by the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the U.N. Special Committee on Apartheid, because it was on March 21, 1960, that the Sharpsville Massacre occurred. Of that day it may well be said, as was said of December 7, 1941, that it was "a day that will live in infamy."

On this day, let us hope and pray that the long, hard winter of race hatred and violence is behind us, and that, if all men of good will everywhere will devote their energies to the task, a season of hope and blossoming lies ahead, leading in due course to a sunny summer for all mankind.

UNEXPECTED ROLLCALL ON H.R. 2068

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to attend the session of the House yesterday when a rollcall vote was unex-

pectedly called for on H.R. 2068. I wish to make it clear that if I had been here, I would have joined in the vote for this excellent legislation.

One of the major features of the legislation is a cost-of-living rate increase for veterans and their survivors, which will bring current pension levels into a more realistic relationship with our rising prices. Another significant provision is the increased educational benefits for those who have already served their country and then attempt to continue their interrupted educations. In addition to these two major additions, the bill contains many different sections remedying inequities or inadequacies in the basic structure of benefits enacted over the years.

The unanimous vote cast by my colleagues yesterday attests to the strength of support for this legislation. It is indeed merited. As one who has consistently supported increases in veterans' pension and educational benefits, I was pleased to see the House give its approval to this carefully formulated and much needed legislation.

STATEMENT OF GOV. JOHN DEMPSEY

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I call to the attention of my colleagues a statement of the Honorable John Dempsey, Governor of Connecticut, delivered this morning at a joint meeting of the New England Governors' Conference and the New England congressional delegation.

In his remarks, the chief executive of Connecticut calls attention to the growing need for effective intergovernmental planning and action. In particular, the Governor illustrates the advantages of a regional approach toward improving mass transportation.

The simple fact remains, as the Governor has pointed out, that there is no concrete, articulated national policy regarding our transportation system. Because of this, an area of major economic strength to our country—the northeast United States—is threatened with the loss of its railroad facilities. The States in this region have attempted to perform the herculean task of trying to work out a solution. But the resources of the National Government are yet to be fully brought to bear against this transportation crisis. What is happening in the northeast may well happen elsewhere. Transportation is a national problem. Must this Government stall and delay until a most important area of our Nation and, perhaps, the entire country is at the brink of a major economic catastrophe? I sincerely hope this will not be the case.

The Governor of my State reminds us of the lack of a thoroughgoing national

program. It is my hope that his words will be taken to heart.

I insert the following statement of Gov. John Dempsey, of the State of Connecticut, at this point:

STATEMENT OF GOVERNOR DEMPSEY AT MEETING OF GOVERNORS, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 21, 1967

The national railroad crisis is a compelling demonstration of the growing need for effective intergovernmental planning and action.

Six years ago the Governors of New York, New Jersey and Connecticut formed the Tri-State Transportation Committee to undertake an immediate attack on existing transportation problems and to develop long-range plans to meet the needs of the metropolitan region of the future.

With substantial federal assistance, Tri-State has assembled the finest data bank on transportation and related land use ever accumulated on any metropolitan area.

An interim plan to meet the transportation needs of the Region projected to 1985 has been developed.

This interim plan found that Connecticut's regional highway needs until 1985 had been largely satisfied with one critical assumption, and that assumption is that the New Haven Railroad must continue in service.

Our situation, simply stated, is this:

We have built roads that threaten to put the railroad out of business—but roads that are efficient only if the railroad does not go out of business.

It has been estimated that highways as alternatives to the New Haven Railroad would cost \$1 billion.

Preserving the New Haven is clearly in the public interest, just as clearly it is a public responsibility.

The lack of a coordinated national transportation policy has led to the development of our transportation facilities in competition with each other rather than in harmony.

The Tri-State plan is a major step in avoiding this pitfall in the future. We have also recommended legislation in Connecticut to establish a Department of Transportation charged with the responsibility of developing a coordinated state transportation plan.

A federal transportation policy has yet to be developed.

In the absence of a clear national policy, and with the New Haven Railroad facing court-ordered abandonment of service, the states of Connecticut, New York, Rhode Island and Massachusetts have implemented a program of interim support for a two-year period.

During this period, the Connecticut-New York Demonstration Project has formulated what we believe to be the key to the rehabilitation of the New Haven's commuter service.

Our plan calls for the investment of \$80 million to completely modernize this service with new cars, new station facilities with high level platforms and improved electrification.

Connecticut has also pledged \$500 thousand toward the Department of Commerce high-speed train experiment scheduled to operate between Boston and New York this summer.

Connecticut has long accepted public responsibility for support of essential rail service.

On my recommendation, the Connecticut General Assembly has enacted legislation that makes \$5 million each year, and up to \$50 million in authorized bonds, available for the support of rail transportation.

Toward the support of long-haul passenger service, Connecticut is paying almost \$2 million, Rhode Island \$1.1 million, and Massachusetts \$550 thousand.

New York and Connecticut, through our

commuter service Demonstration Project, are each paying \$1.5 million to continue all service between New Haven and New York.

This cooperative state action avoided the curtailment of service and provided the time needed to develop required long-term legal and financial arrangements.

Representatives of the four Governors worked as a continuing staff to develop a coordinated position for negotiation with the New Haven Trustees and Penn-Central officials.

A single joint position was arrived at for argument before the Interstate Commerce Commission which resulted in the disapproval of the New Haven's application for abandonment of all passenger service, and in the directive that the entire New Haven be included in the Penn-Central merger.

The states have made substantial contributions, and New York and Connecticut are committed to further extensive investments, to implement the recommendations of the Demonstration Project.

This problem must be considered in the context of our national rail system and should properly be considered as part of our complete national transportation system. The states are doing their share—and more than their share.

It is essential that we press for a clearly defined national transportation policy that recognizes a continuing federal responsibility in the movement of people into and out of our towns and cities.

Our effort in transportation is one example of New England's regional approach to problems that do not respect political boundaries.

Law enforcement, water pollution, economic development, veterinary medicine, education, preservation of natural resources, highway safety, research and hospital management are some of the programs now being carried out on a regional basis.

With the increasing demands on state government it is essential that we marshal our resources and knowledge to find solutions to today's problems and to plan for our needs of the future.

DOMINICK V. DANIELS NAMED HONORARY IRISHMAN

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, last year the State Legislature of the State of New Jersey took the three west Hudson County municipalities of Kearny, Harrison, and East Newark from the 10th Congressional District of the dean of the New Jersey delegation, PETER W. RODINO, who had represented this area with great distinction for 18 years, and assigned them to the 14th District of my good friend and colleague, DOMINICK V. DANIELS. After 18 years, it is quite a sudden switch to have to adopt a new Congressman, and particularly so, after the outstanding job done by PETER RODINO.

However, DOMINICK is the kind of man who likes a challenge and he has applied himself to the task of giving the people of these three towns the kind of representation he has given the people of Jersey City, Hoboken, West New York, Union City, Secaucus, and Weehawken, since January 1959.

If there is any doubt in anyone's mind

as to the kind of reception DOMINICK has received from his new constituents, it certainly was dispelled last Saturday when he was named an honorary Irishman by the Irish-American Association of Kearny, N.J.

I know I join with Mayor Joseph M. Healey, of Kearny, and Hugh O'Neill of the parade committee in wishing the top o' the morning to our new Irishman. Our beloved colleague may look like he belongs in the senate of ancient Rome, but to all of us who are descended from the Celts and Gaels, he is just "one of the boys from home."

THE FUTURE HOMEMAKERS OF AMERICA—MATURE YOUNG WOMEN

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, the Future Homemakers of America will soon bring to a close the observance of their 21st birthday year and, typically feminine, the Future Homemakers belie their age. For in a scant 21 years these young ladies have established a record of such accomplishment, of such remarkable development, that they compare favorably with groups much older than they in years and experience.

Incorporated in 1945 as a nonprofit organization, supported by membership dues, the Future Homemakers of America, as a national organization, was the outgrowth of various State and local clubs all with a shared purpose, a common goal of preserving the American home as the first stone of our social structure.

They were the far-sighted ones, these young people of 1945 for, together with their leaders, they had early recognized the need for a unified program if the changing conditions and challenges of a post war world were to be successfully met.

I add, with all due pride, that Kentucky's State Association was the first to join with the newly founded organization and it is a matter of further pride to all Kentuckians that Miss Mary Belle Vaughn has been the State adviser for this entire time. Miss Vaughn has performed an outstanding service to the young women of our State and we are indeed grateful.

Nationally there are 607,000 members of the Future Homemakers in schools throughout the United States, Puerto Rico, and in American Army post schools. Membership in our State organization alone has grown from approximately 5,000 in 1945 to some 16,000 today and there are 250 active local chapters.

Although much has been said and written about the youth of today, it is still my firm conviction that each succeeding generation of American youth not only lives up to the obligations handed them, but exceed our highest

expectations. The problem youth are in the minority.

Counter the influence of this minority with the strength, for example, of the Future Homemakers, 607,000 young women, marching strong, who delight in the pleasures of homemaking; in growth made possible through knowledge; the just happiness of doing good; of helping a less fortunate friend, a hesitant learner, or a school dropout; of assisting the aged, the infirm, or other of their worthy projects, and it is indeed a reassuring picture.

Now, the Future Homemakers, pleased with the progress they have thus far made, are moving into a new era with a wealth of example and purpose as their criteria. They are hopeful and optimistic, looking forward to fulfilling their worthy ideals and goals. This is, of course, in the spirit of our country, for without the ambitions and dreams of our ancestors for a better life, America would not be the land we know and love today.

We have not forgotten, nor will we ever forget, the nobler things that shaped America's way of life. We know that the stability of our homes is the stability of our Nation. And, so, to my young friends, the Future Homemakers of America, I say that yours will not be an easy role. It will be a tedious role, and, the most treasured of all. I know that you have accepted this charge with grace and courage and my wish for you can only be for the continuation of your past successes.

GIVING THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES THE CHANCE IT DESERVES

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, several times on the floor during the past month, attacks have been made on research grants made by the Humanities Endowment of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. In one set of remarks, entitled "How To Go Broke Without Even Trying," an \$8,789 grant to the University of California for a study of the history of comic strips was singled out. The author of these remarks concluded:

But lest anyone think that this relatively small grant represents the only amount of waste in a time of national economic crisis, I wish to point out that this grant represents only one of many totaling almost \$1 million by the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities. Some of the others are equally absurd and are even less justified during a time of severe strain on the National Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, this commentary reminds me of Mark Twain's observation, that it is the will of God that we must have Congressmen and we must bear the burden. The burden here could be a frightening intellectual bankruptcy. Only

partially masked by the recent attacks on the humanities grant is the ugly face of an anti-intellectualism that closely resembles the McCarthyism of the early 1950's.

The main opponent of the research grants readily admits that his concern is not really with the cost of the research programs in the humanities—congressional appropriations for such research represent less than one two-hundred-and-fiftieth of 1 percent of the national budget. Referring to the research grants, he says:

Many would not be justified even if we had a large budget surplus.

It is as if every dollar the Government spends must buy a dollar's worth of guns or pencils.

But even in the simplistic terms of dollar value, the grants of the Humanities Endowment are of great worth. In this fiscal year the endowment is spending \$300,000 for programs training museum personnel, a badly neglected and important area, particularly now with 300 million persons visiting American museums each year. A small sum allocated by the endowment to improve the presentation of humanistic subjects on instructional television comes at a time when the pressure of student numbers makes this medium a matter of necessity in many classrooms. A research grant for the preparation of biographies of figures in all phases of Chinese life in the 14th to the 17th centuries will provide some of the perspective necessary for intelligent interpretation of the modern China which casts such a great shadow over our role in world affairs.

Several grants are calculated to shape our school and college curriculums, particularly in the area of the social studies and American history. Grants for a new study of the age of Washington and Jefferson, for a compilation of selected court records to illustrate American colonial society, for a study of the political process in American communities, 1870-1900, and others all have this relevance. An earlier grant will cast new light on the thinking of the framers of our Constitution by study of the British Parliament of 1628 which produced the famous Petition of Right.

Even comic strips cannot be dismissed lightly as tools for the historian of our national character. As the distinguished historian Allan Nevins once put it—

American cartoons are invaluable to the student of political history . . . they present in vivid terms many a half-forgotten episode—the Hartford Convention, the Seminole War . . . they recall the burning heat once generated by issues that are now extinct volcanoes . . . along with all this cartoons are singularly useful in portraying the spell which various personalities have cast over the public mind . . . the laugh-provoker of yesterday has become a serious contribution to history.

In short, cartoons and comic strips provide important historical perspective, a perspective we cannot afford to lose sight of in judging the merits of the Government's support of such research.

Barnaby Keeney, Director of the National Endowment for the Humanities,

has clearly stated the endowment's position: pedantry will not be grubstaked. The endowment's record speaks for itself.

The relatively small amount authorized so far by the endowment for individual and institutional grants—\$4,100,000—already makes it the prime source of financing for achievement in the humanities. This stark fact, in contrast to the vast amount of Federal money being spent on the sciences, approximately \$5 billion annually, is ample proof of the need for the endowment.

But quite frankly, I do not think the prime critic of the endowment is concerned with estimating the value, educational or otherwise, of the humanities grants. In his weekly newsletter, he once again attacks the study of comic strips, addressing his remarks to the midriff, not the cortex:

Most assuredly there may be problem areas in American life today which are worthy of consideration in the field of federal research. But it would seem to me, for example, that the University of California, instead of wasting such funds on a study of comic strip history, might do a greater service for both itself and the nation, by making a study of what happens when a great university turns its campus over to nonstudents, who then use it as seed bed (sic) for riot, insurrection and anti-Vietnam demonstrations. Now there's a research project that might well be worth the effort.

My colleague's language harks back to the rantings of the early 1950's when McCarthy frequently put intellectuals under fire. Pontificated one McCarthyite in 1951:

Our universities are the training grounds for the barbarians of the future, those who, in the guise of learning, shall come forth loaded with pitchforks of ignorance and cynicism, and stab and destroy the remnants of human civilization.

Just as I rejected McCarthyism, I now reject the tenor of the attacks on the work of the National Endowment for the Humanities. For it is not just research grants which are at stake. Indeed, the endowment possesses unique qualities which make it quite different from an organization such as the National Science Foundation. As President Johnson has declared:

Science can give us goods—and goods we need. But the humanities—art and literature, poetry and history, law and philosophy—must give us our goals.

Unfortunately, the humanities, as exhibited in our colleges and universities, may be in no condition to shape our national goals. The humanist scholar needs to be encouraged to attempt large-scale evaluations along with his specialized research. And eventually the humanist needs to have the courage to ask fundamental questions which may shake the foundation of our society.

We need a new birth of freedom for the humanities. I look to the National Humanities Endowment to help provide the necessary freedom. The act under which the endowment was created is quite revolutionary, and it ought to be put to revolutionary uses. We must fully exploit the phrase in the act that includes within the jurisdiction of the en-

dowment "those aspects of the social sciences which have humanistic content and employ humanistic methods." This phrase should mean support for focusing on the problems crucial to a society concerned with where it is going.

But first things first. First, Congress must give the National Endowment for the Humanities the chance it deserves. In the projects it has thus far supported, the endowment has fully carried out the will of Congress "to develop and encourage the pursuit of a national policy for the promotion of progress and scholarship in the humanities." By its actions, the endowment has earned our enthusiastic backing.

SUPPORTING THE PRESIDENT'S REQUESTS

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, in this country, the most affluent Nation at the most affluent time in the history of the world, more than 2 million young people between the ages of 16 and 22 are poor. It is hard for most of us to even appreciate the continuous cycle of social and economic deprivation which these children represent. For these children of the poor are strangers in their own land. These are the youth that few people have seen, and have only recently begun to understand.

Society can take its choice: it can do something to make the potentially unemployables employable, and make jobs available to them, or it can resign itself to supporting them on relief, or almost as likely, in the prison system. President Johnson, with the help of the Congress, is doing something about it—and he wants to do more. That much was made clear in his message to the Congress on America's unfinished business: urban and rural poverty. The President called for an increase in the resources of the Office of Economic Opportunity to help, among others, the youth among the poor of this country.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has two primary programs for these castaways—the Job Corps and the Neighborhood Youth Corps. In both, in a crash course, a youth has a chance to become a working, taxpaying, self-supporting citizen.

Those entering the Job Corps bring with them few material possessions or educational skills. Forty-five percent come from broken homes; in more than two-thirds of their families the breadwinner is unemployed; more than 40 percent are from families receiving relief. More than 75 percent have never seen a doctor or a dentist; a large majority need eyeglasses. Most are both undernourished and underweight. Almost all are dropouts from school—is it any wonder? While they have completed more than an eighth grade educa-

tion on the average, most cannot read a newspaper. Out of work, out of school, out of money, life was monotonous, and frustrating. The Job Corps gives them 3 meals a day, warm and presentable clothing; it gives them educational instruction, a chance to learn a trade—and a chance to succeed. It is unique and innovative, and there are problems, but there are accomplishments too: Job Corps have built bridges, fought fires, constructed public facilities. They have aided farmers and volunteered in hospitals.

For the boy or girl who does not seem to need the full 24-hour-a-day life of the Job Corps, the neighborhood Youth Corps is the instrument of choice. In this nationwide program, the enrollees stay in their home environment, are paid \$1.25 an hour for 15 hours' work a week for those staying in school, to 32 hours for those out of school. During fiscal 1966, the Neighborhood Youth Corps created 528,000 community service jobs in 1,477 hometown projects—initiated, developed, and sponsored by public and private nonprofit organizations in line with hometown needs.

Supervisory personnel report that the program has helped many young people realize, most for the first time, that they count in our society, that the United States has faith in its young people, and they have responded well. We must also respond with support for the President's requests.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, March 20, I was at Sheppard Air Force Base, Tex., greeting a delegation of Members of the German Bundestag as they reviewed the German pilot training program conducted there. I therefore missed the vote on final passage of H.R. 2068, a bill increasing benefits paid to certain veterans. If I had been present, I would have voted for passage.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, for 35 years Washington has been the adopted hometown of our President, Lyndon B. Johnson.

Even though the city's broad, busy avenues and majestic buildings offer a pointed contrast to the Texas hill coun-

try where he was born, the President obviously holds a deep affection for Washington.

This was true during his 32 years of service on Capitol Hill, and has been reflected clearly by his actions since he became President.

During his tenure in the Presidency he has taken many steps to improve the city, for the benefit not only of the people who reside here but for the Nation as well. These steps—and the steps he hopes to take in the future—mirror the acute sense of personal responsibility President Johnson feels for the well-being of Washington and its people.

Nowhere is this more evident than in the President's February 27 message to Congress on the District of Columbia.

In this document the President declares his conviction that our Nation's Capital and its government must be made "a living expression of the highest ideals of democratic government."

It should be—

In the President's words—

a city of beauty and inspiration, of equal justice and opportunity. It should be a model for every American city, large and small. It should be a city in which our citizens and our friends from abroad can live and work, visit our great national monuments, and enjoy our parks and walk our streets without fear.

This is a worthy goal, and the President offers many specific recommendations for its accomplishment. He has called once again for home rule and proposed, as an interim measure, a reorganization of the city's government.

His message also set out a comprehensive 10-point program for battling crime in the District of Columbia, and proposed a constitutional amendment to provide citizens here with representation in Congress.

As one Member of Congress, I would like to commend the President for these recommendations, and to express hope that the Congress supports them.

Especially important, I believe, are the President's proposals to give citizens of the District a voice in their own government, both local and national.

"Taxation without representation" is the rallying cry on which this country was founded. If it was unfair in 1776 to impose levies on people without giving them the right to express themselves in the councils of government, it is doubly wrong today.

Especially is it repugnant at the very time that American fighting men—from the District of Columbia as well as from the 50 States—are in southeast Asia, defending with their very lives the right of self-determination for the people of South Vietnam.

It is the Congress of the United States that provides to the President the support that allows our men to battle for freedom in Vietnam. Yet these men, their sisters and their brothers, their mothers and their fathers, are denied representation in Congress if they happen to be residents of the District of Columbia.

How much longer will the Congress and the Nation tolerate such a gross inequity? Surely the situation is in-

defensible to any who truly believe in representative government.

In his message President Johnson has charted the way for us to wipe away this great wrong and to make Washington a city in which all Americans can take even greater pride. I urge my colleagues to support his proposals.

INTERNATIONAL DAY FOR THE ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DIS- CRIMINATION

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARSTEIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations has proclaimed Tuesday, March 21, as the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination.

One of the gravest problems facing the peoples of the world today is that of racial discrimination. Man has an inalienable right to be treated as an individual, to be judged solely on the merits of his knowledge and skills, and to possess equal access to attaining this knowledge and skill. The curtailment of this most cherished right limits the ability of the individual to develop his potential to the fullest, to raise his family in an atmosphere of security and pride, and to participate in the activities of the society to which he belongs.

In this session of Congress, we elected representatives of the American people must face the ever present problem of civil rights specifically as related to the plight of the American Negro who has been unable to assume his rightful role in the society of which he is a lawful citizen. In 1964, Congress passed a civil rights act which prohibited discrimination in housing, promotion, and working conditions, and established the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to carry out this congressional mandate. In 1965, Congress passed the Voting Rights Act which sought to guarantee the right to vote particularly to those people prohibited by arbitrary racial limitations. In 1967, the Congress once again must strive to erase one of the most limiting of civil restrictions, that on housing. Each man must have the right of accessibility to adequate housing regardless of race.

Lest any other nation or person be tempted to gain satisfaction from the American dilemma, let me simply point out that the United States has not cornered the market on this problem. In fact, the United States if anything has taken a more open position in tackling this depriver of rights than most nations.

I would be remiss if I didn't make note of probably the most flagrant violator of this inalienable right anywhere in the world. I speak specifically of South Africa and its policy of apartheid. The 21st of March is a symbolic occasion for an international day because it also marks the seventh anniversary of the Sharpsville Massacre in South Africa. This

tragic event resulted in the massacre of black Africans who were peacefully demonstrating against the humiliating "pass laws" which restricted their freedom of movement and employment. These laws were the result of a deliberate policy of racial segregation by a white-controlled government.

Although it may be appropriate to dwell on the South Africa problem, one can look to almost any area of the world and see examples of discrimination which, if not totally racial, often ultimately relates to race differences. The drama of the Jewish people, past and present, serves as a constant reminder of the danger. The foreign policy focus of the Chinese Communists on the yellow and brown man, has become almost an obsession. The wake of nationalism sweeping developing nations, particularly Africa, is a modern-day reality. All of these situations in varying degrees involves racial discrimination.

The enjoyment of such basic human rights as the right to vote, to equality in the administration of justice, to equal economic opportunities, and to equal access to social services, are universal rights which are held dear by all people throughout the world.

The United Nations has seen fit to pass this resolution proclaiming an international day for the elimination of racial discrimination. I wish to state my support for this resolution and hope that we and all peoples of the world can use this day to resolve anew their belief that man should not be restricted in developing his full potential due to racial discrimination.

EDUCATION

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I will give my wholehearted support this year, as I have in previous years, to the President's proposals to improve the level of education in this country. The President has, during his term of office, provided remarkable leadership in the education field. His proposals for 1967 reflect the continued vigor and imagination of the thinking in his administration in the education field. I am enthusiastic about the provisions in the 1967 educational program to overcome the shortage of qualified teachers, to improve student loans, to extend the Teacher Corps, to educate the handicapped and to combat illiteracy in adults. It is on this last point that I want to dwell, both because of the importance of this provision and because of the obstacles it faces in the current year.

Adult basic education is clearly one of the most successful programs in the Government's education package. It enables men and women to come back from hopelessness. It shows them that, even after they are adults, they can still have

decades of productive life before them, if they will grasp the educational opportunities offered them. The figures indicate that tens of thousands of adults have already taken these opportunities and have made significant steps in the direction of improving their productive capacities and themselves.

But I believe that this program, insufficiently appreciated, has been insufficiently financed. Last year, adult basic education worked with a total of \$35 million, counting a holdover that was unspent in fiscal 1965. For the current year, \$40 million was authorized but, I regret to say, only \$30 million was actually appropriated. Last year, more than 19,000 adults were enrolled in adult basic education courses in New York alone. The success of the program should have been sufficient spur to increase the appropriation. In reality, this year New York has been forced to work with \$1.3 million less than last year for its adult basic education. To me, this is unmitigated cruelty—to hold out hope to these people, then to snatch it away from them.

Mr. Speaker, legislation has been introduced to include \$10 million in a supplemental appropriation to strengthen adult basic education in the current year. I strongly support that legislation. I very vigorously urge the Appropriations Committee to make this investment possible—an investment in adult Americans for the betterment of our country.

The President, in his message on education, announced that he would ask for \$44 million in the appropriation to combat adult illiteracy during the forthcoming year. I regard the request as modest. If the full amount is appropriated, then it will permit a small growth for adult education. I think that the program deserves better support. It is no longer experimental; it has proven its value. I have received countless letters from its beneficiaries, telling me how important the program is to them. It should benefit many, many more. I urge the Appropriations Committee to give special attention to this provision of the education program when it comes before them for consideration.

I strongly support sufficient funds to carry out the existing program for the Teachers Corps and to implement vital summer activities of the corps. Often called "the best bargain in the Federal education program," the Teachers Corps encourages and enables experienced and young teacher interns to teach culturally deprived children in poor urban and rural areas. It has won impressive support of the National Education Association and other educational groups and leaders, and I regret this excellent program has not had full support in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the many claims being made on our budget, from at home and abroad, must not obscure the truth in the observation that sound education is the foundation of the Nation. No matter what the demands elsewhere, we are being shortsighted by failing to give education full support. I believe that, more than any other single factor, our greatness depends on it.

THE CSO STORY: COMMITMENT TO PROGRESS

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Brown] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I should like to pay homage today to an organization which is deserving of the highest admiration and praise. I speak of the Community Service Organization, a grassroots civic action organization whose members are motivated by a faith that the people can work out their own destinies, and that the privileges and responsibilities of democratic citizenship are defended and developed more by what we do on the community level and within the neighborhood than by what we say. As stated in "The Los Angeles CSO Story: American Democracy Is Not a Fake," an article published by the organization:

CSO is not a political movement, nor is it a relief agency. It is a civic-action group, dedicated to helping people to help themselves . . . It is, in short, a modern town hall, where people thrash out common problems, plan socially useful actions, and carry them out.

I am honored and proud to say that I have many fine friends who are members of the CSO. My colleague, the gentleman from California, Congressman EDWARD ROYBAL, was among its founding members, and to this day is listed as a prominent member of the group. The membership of the CSO continues to grow, and with it grows also the hopes and aspirations of hundreds of thousands of Spanish-speaking citizens of the great Southwest, the area where this organization is centered.

Most present here today will remember the infamous "Zoot-suit" riots which erupted in Los Angeles during World War II. Emotions flared into violence, and pent-up frustrations on both sides were vented. But out of this tragic incident, there came a formal recognition that what had taken place was a confrontation between Americans—not a confrontation between Americans and Mexicans. During that period, a protest from the Government of Mexico demanding that Mexicans within this country be treated as equals and accorded all the respect extended to other citizens, was answered with a curt reply that every effort would be made to assure that all Americans would indeed be protected, but that this Government would remind the Mexican Government that what had taken place, tragic as it had been, was an American affair and, consequently, subject to an American solution.

This incident, although significant, was but one among many which strengthened the communitywide efforts to lift up our American citizens who had been relegated to second-class status, left out of the mainstream of America's progress, and in many cases locked out of the

larger community activities. The barrio became alive with new impetus from groups such as the Community Service Organization. Some initial undertakings of the organization came under heavy criticism and well-entrenched apathy and defeatism were formidable foes. But the problems were attacked from within and outside the barrio, for the door was to be opened from both sides. This basic belief has taken root within the CSO, and its success is a testament to its approach to community problems.

Long before the faltering war on poverty entered the current scene, there were battles being waged by the CSO on poverty and its attendant evils. As far back as 1947, this small but dedicated group of spirited citizens was awakening the hope of great numbers of people to the dream of America. The path was arduous and the frustrations many, but the idea received nourishment from a people who had long been neglected and, indeed, in many cases, rejected by the majority group within the society.

Through numerous committees such as the one on voter education, a traditionally silent people began to organize themselves into a unified voice. The idea that the political key would open the lock to many other doors became the prime motivating force, and, I might add, they were essentially correct in their assumption. As the list of voters with Spanish surnames gradually increased, the public authorities began to sit up and take notice, and to move ahead with programs to assist these people.

We know that this forward thrust has not subsided, much less, ended, but that it continues to this day. And it will not be restrained. For we know also, that whenever and wherever injustices abound in this or any society then the ideas which have motivated this particular civic organization will motivate other such groups of a like nature and purpose.

True, the dynamic mobilization phase of the CSO is past, but a whole new spectrum of activity awaits those of us who would seek to continue our commitment to public advancement. The Los Angeles chapter of the Community Service Organization is presently extending into new areas centered around mutual-aid programs. The progress which they are forging should be enviable to any civic improvement group in this Nation. The future appears even more hopeful for, as we well know, commitment to progress is an open-ended proposition. There is no end to the good we can accomplish together, if we will but pledge ourselves to constructive rather than to destructive ends.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I offer these few humble remarks in tribute to an organization which, I am proud to say, is centered in my home State of California and found its birth and impetus in and around my congressional district in Los Angeles County. I, for one, am of the firm belief that the promise of the Community Service Organization is relevant not only to that group which it primarily serves, but to all of us—for the promise it offers is hope, fulfillment, and community pride.

LOS ANGELES BASIN IS HAZARDOUS FIRE AREA

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Brown] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, because of certain unusual geographical features and meteorological conditions, the Los Angeles "basin" area has always been a hazardous setting for fires. The physical situation in the basin presents a challenge that is perhaps unique in the world. Hot, drying winds, known as Santa Ana winds, come in from the desert each year, bringing with them the danger of fire. In recent years, television viewers across the Nation have seen some of the devastation caused by these fires in the Bel Air and Brentwood sections of the city. The problem has been aggravated by the gradual extension of housing developments out into the basin. Fortunately, the fire departments in the Los Angeles area have developed an outstanding partnership of cooperation to face this common problem. However, more needs to be done. There is no reason why the Los Angeles basin should have to face the threat of fires year after year, without hope of being able to eliminate or at least control this tragic menace. We must tap new knowledge, new technology, new approaches, if we are to cope successfully with the threat to life and property posed by unwanted fires.

President Johnson, in his message, to protect the American consumer, pointed out that some 12,000 lives and more than \$1.75 billion in property damages were lost to fires in this country in 1965. The President called for a major national effort to reduce our shameful loss of life and property resulting from fires.

I have therefore introduced H.R. 7270, the Fire Research and Safety Act of 1967, to provide a foundation of knowledge, research, education, and action which will help turn down the rising trend in fire deaths and property losses.

The proposed program is a sound and reasonable approach to this national problem. I make that statement because the program would accomplish its objectives through support and expansion of existing public and private programs, wherever possible. There are many groups that have been involved in fire research and safety activities for years, but in spite of their efforts, the death rate curves and the property loss curves have continued to rise. Obviously, the work of these important institutions needs to be supported and augmented.

The program outlined in the bill I have introduced would include, first, investigation of the frequency and severity of fires and research on the causes of fires; second, education of the public on fire hazards and safety techniques, and training of firemen on the latest methods for fighting fires; third, information services to disseminate the latest knowledge on all aspects of fire safety; and

fourth, demonstration projects to study the feasibility of new ways to prevent and control fires. Grants to accomplish the objectives of the program could be made to State and local governments, and other public and nonprofit institutions.

In my view, this bill represents a practical first step toward meeting a threat that exists in every part of the country, wherever people live. The threat becomes more severe as Americans tend to live closer and closer together in densely populated urban and suburban areas.

I urge all Members to examine this proposal thoughtfully, and I invite support for this bill from everyone.

"DOWN WITH MAJORITY RULE" SAYS THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of any Member who might have missed the comic section the Washington Post calls its editorial page, I would like to insert in the RECORD the lead editorial they ran this morning, titled "Assault on the Constitution."

The Post is "shocked" to learn that a majority of the States are planning a "sneak attack," a "back-door assault" on the Constitution by following its provisions. The specter of a majority of the States petitioning the Congress, as prescribed by the Constitution, has the Post frothing. Their trauma is, of course, understandable only in the context of their gloriously inconsistent philosophy. The idea of anyone following the precepts and provisions of the Constitution is Gorgonian to the Post.

Why, if such a thing caught on, there would be no end to it. The next thing you knew, people would be demanding their rights, too, and how could we build a wonderful and great federalist society if the States and people do not willingly submit to the Federal Government? Unless such ridiculousness as this is stopped at once, that old, wornout document might even regain some of its importance, and then where would we be?

And so the Post cries, "Down with the majority." To them, a majority of the States expressing the will of the majority of the people sends a chill down their spineless spine.

Conveniently, the Post overlooks that it has taken in the past, every possible side of the majority rule question. Whenever a minority prevents cloture in the Senate, the Post cries, "Down with minority rule." Who knows about tomorrow?

The record of the Post is undeviating. They are consistently inconsistent.

The editorial follows:

ASSAULT ON THE CONSTITUTION

News that 32 states are demanding a constitutional convention comes as a shock because the movement has been pushed quiet-

ly. Apparently its sponsors fear that knowledge of what they are trying to do will be fatal to their cause. In any event, they have chosen a back-door method of seeking amendment of the Constitution after the front door has been closed to them. In effect, it is a sneak attack which, if successful, would expose the whole Constitution to peril.

The founding fathers did provide that "on the application of the legislatures of two thirds of the several states" Congress "shall call a convention for proposing amendments" to the Constitution. But this clumsy method has never been used. All 25 of the amendments have been proposed by Congress and ratified by the states. The reason is obvious. At no time has Congress or the country been willing to open the basic structure of our Government and the charter of our liberties to the unpredictable whims of a new convention.

The sponsors of the current movement seem to be aware of this hostility toward a wide-open convention. So they are petitioning Congress to call a convention for the specific purpose of adopting an amendment which they have already proposed. It is the substance of the Dirksen amendment to permit the states to apportion one house of their legislatures on "factors other than population" so as to overturn the Supreme Court's so-called one-man-one-vote ruling. But the Senate has already rejected the resolution sponsored by Senator Dirksen for the same purpose. What the 32 states are trying to do, therefore, is to usurp the congressional function of proposing specific amendments. Because of this and other defects and inconsistencies in the resolutions passed by the 32 states, the movement may well fail even if two more states (making a two-thirds majority) join this risky parade. The Constitution does not say that Congress must call a convention, on application of two thirds of the states, to propose a specific amendment. Congress might well reject the request of the states on the ground that they are trying to take over the congressional function of offering specific amendments.

Congress could raise various other legitimate objections to the venture and as a last resort it could simply fail to pass legislation for the selection of convention delegates. But no such emergency device should be necessary. Every state legislature that has not been sucked into this dangerous venture should be alerted to what is happening. It is difficult to believe that well-informed legislators will risk such hazards to our constitutional underpinnings if they know what they are doing. This back-door assault on the Constitution should be stopped.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, one of the areas in which this Congress has the opportunity to distinguish itself is in consumer protection. I say that because it will cost little or no money. We hear much these days about the need to save money to meet our commitments abroad. Mr. Speaker, we can make a great record in the current Congress without spending a dime—by enacting the regulations that are needed to protect the American consumer. This is one of the reasons

why I am so enthusiastic about the President's proposals on consumer protection. I look forward to their being given careful attention, by both the majority and the minority party. Here is an opportunity for us to be of service to the American people, without being cavalier about the challenges overseas. I commend the President for his consumer proposals and I look forward to the enactment in this session of many of them.

Perhaps no proposal has more to recommend it than the truth-in-lending measure. Can Republican or Democrat be opposed to honesty? Yet, that is all this proposal calls for. It calls for an end to the practice of representing credit charges speciously, in a manner designed to conceal their real magnitude. It is designed to help every consumer, but particularly those who lack the sophistication to know the implications of concealed credit costs. I might add that there are few of us who can grapple with all manner of credit presentation. I have personally received credit proposals that would, I think, challenge an Einstein's efforts to determine real cost. I do not know of a good argument against this bill. I know of only excuses. I can think of no better demonstration of the good intentions of this Congress than to enact the truth-in-lending measure promptly.

Mr. Speaker, I will not go point-for-point through the President's consumer program, exciting though it is. But I say to myself, how can any Member of Congress dedicated to the public interest be against regulations designed to assure honesty—not only in lending but in such areas as interstate land sales, the administration of pension and welfare funds, and the operation of mutual funds? We do not need laws against stealing in the old-fashioned sense, because those have always been on our books in response to eternal needs. But now we have new needs—and we must respond in new fashion. Interstate land sales, large pension and welfare funds, mutual funds, all these are new phenomena in our affluent society. Because they are new, there are loopholes through which unscrupulous operators can function to make unmerited and often dishonest profits.

The law has not yet caught up to the existence of these phenomena and, I believe, it is our responsibility to make the leap. A generation or two ago, it made no difference if there were no laws to protect investors in mutual funds because the practice of mutual funding, for all practical purposes, did not exist. Now it exists and we must surround it with the same safeguards that houses have for protection against burglary and banks have for protection against embezzlement. I recommend acceptance of the President's proposals on these matters.

In similar fashion, we must now catch up in areas of public health. I will support the President in the effort to apply appropriate standards to the manufacture of medical devices, to the practices of our clinical laboratories, to the inspection of meat. We cannot afford to take chances any longer, to accommodate those who would be dishonest or slovenly in their dealings with the consumer.

Mr. Speaker, I endorse the proposals

the President makes to insure the reliability of our electric power and to guarantee the safety of our gas-pipeline network. The average citizen is unable to cope with these matters on his own. He is powerless to enforce on those who transmit natural gas, a system of standards that will free him from the fear of explosion and, in some cases, asphyxiation. He is powerless to make the electric utilities employ equipment and methods that will prevent interruptions of power. The marketplace is impotent to impose these standards, but still they are very necessary. Only government can do it and I recommend that we give prompt consideration to the President's plans.

We can act in this session, Mr. Speaker, We can fulfill our responsibilities to our constituents, without increasing the cost of government. We can do it by enacting protective legislation for consumers. I believe Congress, should focus its attention on this area, where so much attention is so badly needed.

ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBERSTEIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I join with my colleagues in observance of Greek Independence Day. March 25 marks the 146th anniversary of the independence of the land universally acclaimed as the cradle of philosophy, of rhetoric, of science, of the arts, of great theories concerning mankind, and of democracy and freedom.

Almost a century and a half ago, on March 25, 1821, a little band of dedicated, freedom-loving Greek patriots unfurled the banner of revolt against the tyranny of Ottoman rule. Their zeal and the justice of their cause stirred the hearts of freedom-loving peoples throughout the earth. Among those who flocked to their standard were Americans, who themselves had enjoyed independence for only a short time. Many U.S. citizens journeyed to Greece to fight on the side of the valiant Greek patriots. Many American communities donated aid to the Greek cause. In 1822, in a message to Congress, President James Monroe summarized the American attitude toward the Greek war for independence:

Genius and delicacy in the arts, daring and heroism in action, unselfish patriotism, enthusiastic zeal, and devotion to public and private liberty, all these are connected with the name of ancient Greece. It is natural therefore that their [the Greeks'] contest should arouse the sympathy of the entire United States.

The Greek cause ultimately prevailed, and their victory was formally recognized in the Treaty of Constantinople—July 1832—when the Turks renounced all claims of rule over the Greek land.

Thus, after a long and difficult fight the independent Greek state arose and assumed its rightful place once again in the assemblage of sovereign nations. Aided by the genius and determination of the Greek people, the nation was able to progress toward strength and full maturity.

Yet, following World War II Greek independence was mortally threatened. Not only had the war's devastation brought economic chaos, but Communist-led guerrillas hindered attempts at unification and reconstruction. Moreover, in 1947, the British, who had extended economic and military aid to Greece in the early postwar years, announced that their own financial crisis would force them to discontinue their aid. Greece petitioned the United States for help, and on March 12, 1947, President Harry S. Truman went before the Congress for the authority to extend \$400 million of economic and military aid to the beleaguered nations of Greece and Turkey. The President regarded the situation as a national emergency and declared that "the foreign policy and the national security of the United States" were directly involved in Greece. The Congress honored the President's request. Additional grants and loans followed, and technical experts were sent to help rebuild the country. This aid, plus the decisive factor of Greek innovative ability, resilience, and perseverance, enabled Greece to defeat the Communist threat and to proceed with the task of economic recovery. In the two decades since proclamation of the Truman doctrine, Greece has realized outstanding economic development and progress.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, on this anniversary of Greek Independence Day, we here in America are proud to recall an outstanding instance in the postwar era when we were able to help the Greek people maintain their self-government. At the same time, this great day stirs us to recall the enormous debt that we owe the Greek civilization for its contribution to mankind. On this happy occasion, let us renew our commitment to the Greek ideal of democracy and freedom and pray that all men everywhere may soon attain individual liberty and that all nations may be blessed with independence. Again, it is with great pleasure that I extend my congratulations and warmest wishes to our Greek friends in my own 19th District of New York, throughout the United States, and all over the world.

MUST NOT FAIL IN VIETNAM

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FULTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday the city of Metropolitan Nashville, Davidson County, Tenn., was privileged to host President and Mrs. Lyndon Johnson.

The occasion was March 15, 1967, the 200th anniversary of the birth of President Andrew Jackson. Appropriate ceremonies were held at President Jackson's home, the Hermitage, that morning at which time the President and First Lady spoke and the Post Office Department issued a special stamp in its "prominent American" series honoring Old Hickory.

During his visit to Nashville, President Johnson gave a major address on the administration's Vietnam policy before the Tennessee General Assembly in which he very succinctly outlined again our goals and aspirations for peace and the people of Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the text of the President's remarks in the Record at this point:

L.B.J. TEXT TO LEGISLATORS: MUST NOT FAIL IN VIETNAM

(This is the text of the address given by President Johnson to a joint session of the Tennessee Legislature at noon yesterday:)

Ladies and Gentlemen, it is always a special pleasure for me to visit Tennessee.

For a Texan, it is like a homecoming. Much of the courage and hard work that went into the building of the Southwest came from the hills and fields of Tennessee. It strengthened the sinews of thousands of men—at the Alamo, at San Jacinto, and in the homes of a pioneer people.

WORLD CHANGES

This morning I visited the Hermitage, the historic home of Andrew Jackson. Two centuries have passed since that most American of Americans was born. The world has changed much since his day. But the qualities which sustain men and nations in positions of leadership have not changed.

In our time as in Jackson's, freedom has its price.

In our time as in his, history conspires to test the American will.

In our times as in his, courage, vision, and the willingness to sacrifice will sustain the cause of freedom.

This generation of Americans is making its imprint on history in the fierce hills and sweltering jungles of Vietnam. I think most of our citizens have—after a very penetrating debate which is our democratic heritage—reached a common understanding on the meaning and objectives of that struggle.

Before I discuss the specific questions that remain at issue, let me review the points of widespread agreement.

Two years ago we were forced to choose and forced to make major commitments in defense of South Vietnam and retreat—

The evacuation of more than 25,000 of our troops.

The collapse of the Republic of Vietnam in the face of subversion and external assault.

Andrew Jackson would never have been surprised at our choice.

We chose a course in keeping with our tradition, with the foreign policy of three administrations, with the expressed will of Congress, with our solemn obligations under the Southeast Asian Treaty, and with the interests of sixteen million South Vietnamese who had no wish to live under Communist domination.

OPPOSITION RISES

As our commitment in Vietnam required more men and equipment, some voices were raised in opposition. The administration was urged to disengage, to find an excuse to abandon the effort.

These cries came despite growing evidence that the defense of Vietnam held the key to the political and economic future of free

Asia. The stakes of the struggle grew correspondingly.

It became clear that if we were prepared to stay the course in Vietnam, we could help to lay the cornerstone for a diverse and independent Asia, full of promise and resolute in the cause of peaceful economic development for her long-suffering peoples.

But if we faltered, the forces of chaos would scent victory and decades of strife and aggression would stretch endlessly before us.

IN TO STAY

The choice was clear. We would stay the course. And we shall stay the course.

I think most Americans support this fundamental decision. Most of us remember the fearful cost of ignoring aggression. Most of us have cast aside the illusion that we can live in an affluent fortress while the world slides into chaos.

I think we have all reached broad agreement on our basic objectives in Vietnam.

First, an honorable peace, that will leave the people of South Vietnam free to fashion their own political and economic institutions without fear of terror or intimidation from the North.

Second, a Southeast Asia in which all countries—including a peaceful North Vietnam—apply their scarce resources to the real problems of their people: combating hunger, ignorance, and disease.

PEACE PREFERRED

I have said many times that nothing would give us greater pleasure than to invest our own resources in the constructive works of peace rather than the futile destruction of war.

Third, a concrete demonstration that aggression across international frontiers and demarcation lines is no longer an acceptable means of political change.

There is also a general agreement among Americans on the things we do not want in Vietnam.

We do not want permanent bases. We will begin withdrawal of our troops on a reasonable schedule whenever reciprocal concessions are forthcoming from our adversary.

We do not seek to impose our political beliefs upon South Vietnam. Our republic rests upon a brisk commerce in ideas. We will be happy to see free competition in the intellectual marketplace whenever North Vietnam is willing to shift the conflict from the battlefield to the ballot box.

These are the broad principles on which most Americans agree.

ANSWERS

On a less general level, however, the events and frustrations of these past few difficult weeks have inspired a number of questions about our Vietnam policy in the minds and hearts of many of our citizens. Today in this historical chamber I want to deal with some of those questions that figure most prominently in the press and the many letters which reach a president's desk.

Many Americans are confused by the barrage of information about military engagements. They long for the capsule summary which has kept tabs on previous wars, a line on the map dividing friend from foe.

Precisely what, they ask, is our military situation, and what are the prospects of victory?

The first answer is that Vietnam is aggression in a new guise, as far removed from trench warfare as the rifle from the longbow. This is a war of infiltration, of subversion, of ambush. Pitched battles are rare, and even more rarely decisive.

COURSE REVERSED

Today, more than 1 million men from the Republic of Vietnam and its six allies are engaged in the order of battle.

Despite continuing increases in North Vietnam infiltration, this strengthening of Allied

Forces in 1966 was instrumental in reversing the whole course of the war:

We estimate that 55,000 North Vietnamese and Viet Cong were killed in 1966, compared with 35,000 the previous year. Many more were wounded, and more than 20,000 defected.

By contrast, 9,500 South Vietnamese, more than 5,000 Americans, and 600 from other Allied Forces were killed in action.

The Vietnamese army achieved a 1966 average of two weapons captured from the Viet Cong to every one lost, a dramatic turn around from the previous two years.

Allied forces have made several successful sweeps through territories that were formerly considered Viet Cong sanctuaries only a short time ago. These operations not only cost the enemy large numbers of his men and weapons, but are very damaging to his morale.

What does this mean?

Will the North Vietnamese change tactics? Will there be less infiltration of main units and more guerrilla warfare?

The actual truth is we don't know.

What we do know is that General Westmoreland's strategy has produced results, that our military position has substantially improved, and that our military success has permitted the groundwork to be laid for a pacification program which is the long-run key to an independent South Vietnam.

Since February 1965, our military operations have included selective bombing of military targets in North Vietnam. Our purposes are three:

To back our fighting men by denying the enemy a sanctuary;

To exact a penalty against North Vietnam for her flagrant violation of the Geneva Accords of 1954 and 1962;

To limit the flow, or substantially increase the cost of infiltration of men and materiel from North Vietnam.

All intelligence confirms that we have been successful.

POLICY QUESTIONED

Yet, some of our people object strongly to this aspect of our policy. Must we bomb? Many people ask. Does it do any military good? Is it consistent with America's limited objectives? Is it an inhuman act that's aimed at civilians?

On the question of military utility, I can only report the firm belief of the secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Central Intelligence Agency, General Westmoreland and the commanders in the field and all the advice available to the commander in chief that the bombing is causing serious disruption and added expense to the North Vietnamese infiltration effort.

We know, for example, that half a million people are kept busy just repairing bomb damage to bridges, roads, railroads, and other strategic facilities, and in air and coastal defense.

I also want to say categorically that it is not the position of the American government that the bombing will be decisive in getting Hanoi to abandon aggression. It has however, created very serious problems for them. The best indication of how substantial is the fact that they are working so hard every day with all fronts throughout the world to get us to stop.

BOMBING LOGICAL

The bombing is entirely consistent with our limited objectives in South Vietnam. The strength of Communist main-force units in the south is clearly based on infiltration from the north. It is simply unfair to American soldiers, sailors, and marines—and Vietnamese soldiers—to ask them to face increased enemy personnel and fire power without making an effort to reduce that infiltration.

As for bombing civilians, I would simply say that we are making an effort unprecedented in the history of warfare to be sure

that we do not. It is our policy to bomb military targets only.

We have never deliberately bombed cities, nor attacked any target with the purpose of inflicting civilian casualties.

We hasten to add, however, recognize, and regret, that some people living and working in the vicinity of military targets have suffered.

We also are all too aware that men and machines are not infallible, and that some mistakes do occur.

But our record on this account, is in my opinion highly defensible.

Look for a moment at the record of the other side.

Any civilian casualties that result from our operations are inadvertent, in stark contrast to the calculated Viet Cong policy of systematic terror.

Tens of thousands of innocent Vietnamese civilians have been killed, tortured and kidnapped by the Viet Cong. There is no doubt about the deliberate nature of the Viet Cong program. One need only note the frequency with which Viet Cong victims are village leaders, teachers, health workers and others trying to carry out constructive programs for these people.

WEARY OF CRITICS

Yet the deeds of the Viet Cong go largely unnoted in the public debate. It is this moral double bookkeeping which makes us sometimes very weary of some of our critics.

But there is another question: Why don't we stop bombing to make it easier for them to begin negotiations?

The answer is a simple one. We stopped for 5 days and 29 hours in May 1965. Representatives of Hanoi simply returned our message in a plain envelope.

We stopped bombing for 36 days and 15 hours in December 1965 and January 1966. And Hanoi only replied: "A political settlement of the Vietnam problem can be envisaged only when the United States Government has accepted the four point stand of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, has proved this by actual deeds, has stopped unconditionally and for good its air raids and all other acts of war against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam."

And only last month we stopped bombing for 5 days and 18 hours, after many prior weeks in which we had communicated to them several possible routes to peace, any one of which America was prepared to take. Their response, as delivered to his Holiness the Pope, was this: The United States "must put an end to their aggression in Vietnam, end unconditionally and definitely the bombing and all other acts of war against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, withdraw from South Vietnam all American and satellite troops, recognize the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation, and let the Vietnamese people settle themselves their own affairs."

That is where we stand today.

INTENTIONS SNUBBED

They have three times rejected a bombing pause as a means to open the way to ending the war and going to the negotiating table.

The tragedy of South Vietnam is not limited to casualty lists.

There is much tragedy in the story of a nation at war for nearly a generation. It is the story of economic stagnation. It is the story of a generation of young men—the flower of the labor force—pressed into military service by one side or the other.

No one denies that the survival of South Vietnam is heavily dependent upon early economic progress.

My most recent and hopeful report of progress in this area came from an old friend of the Tennessee Valley Authority—David Lillenthal, who recently went as my representative to Vietnam to work with the Vietnamese on economic planning.

He reported—with some surprise, I might add—that he discovered an extraordinary air of confidence among farmers, village leaders, trade unionists, and industrialists. He concluded that their economic behavior suggests "that they think they know how this all is going to come out."

Mr. Lillenthal also said that the South Vietnamese were among the hardest-working people he had seen in developing countries around the world, that "to have been through 20 years of war and still have this amount of 'zip' almost ensures their long-term economic development."

Mr. Lillenthal will be going with me to Guam and he will talk about his plans for the area.

Our AID programs are also supporting the drive toward a sound economy.

But none of these economic accomplishments will be decisive in itself. And no economic achievement can substitute for a strong and free political structure.

We cannot build such a structure because only the Vietnamese can do that.

BUILD FOR PEACE

And, I think, they are building it. As I am talking to you here, a freely elected constituent assembly in Saigon is wrestling with the last details of a new constitution, one which will bring the Republic of Vietnam to full membership among the democratic nations of the world.

In the midst of war, they have been building for peace and justice. That is a remarkable accomplishment in the annals of mankind.

Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, who has served us with such great distinction is coming to the end of his second distinguished tour of duty in Saigon. To replace him, I am drafting as our ambassador to the government of Vietnam Mr. Ellsworth Bunker, able and devoted, full of wisdom and experience acquired on five continents over many years.

As his deputy, I am nominating and recalling from Pakistan Mr. Eugene Locke, our young and very vigorous ambassador to Pakistan.

To drive forward with a sense of urgency, the work in pacification in Vietnam, I am sending presidential assistant Robert Komer to strengthen General Westmoreland in the intensive operations that he will be conducting in the months ahead, I am assigning to him additional top-flight military personnel—the best that the country has been able to provide.

CONFIDENT

So you can be confident that in the months ahead we shall have at work in Saigon the ablest, wisest, the most tenacious and the most experienced team that the United States can mount.

In view of these decisions, and in view of the meetings that will take place this weekend, I thought it wise to invite the leaders of South Vietnam to join us in Guam for a part of our discussion. If it were convenient for them.

I am gratified to be able to inform you that they have accepted our invitation. I should like you to know that representatives of all the countries that have troops in Vietnam will meet in Washington April 20-21 for a general appraisal of the situation.

This brings me to my final point: the peaceful, just world we all seek.

We have just lived through another flurry of "rumors of peace feelers." Our years of dealing with this problem have taught us that peace will not come easily.

The problem is a very simple one: it takes two to negotiate, and Hanoi has refused to simply consider.

I don't believe that our own position on peace negotiations can be stated any more clearly than I have stated it in the past—or than Secretary Rusk, Ambassador Goldberg,

and any number of other officials have stated it in every forum we could find. I repeat the essentials now, lest there be any doubts.

United States representatives are ready at any time for discussions of the Vietnam problem or any related matter, with any government or governments, if there is any reason to believe it will advance the cause of peace.

We are prepared to go more than halfway and to use any avenue possible to encourage such discussion.

We believe that the Geneva Accords of 1954 and 1962 could serve as the central elements of a peaceful settlement. These accords provide, in essence, that both South and North Vietnam should be free from external interference, while at the same time they would be free and independent to determine their positions on the question of reunification.

We also stand ready to advance toward a reduction of hostilities, without prior agreement. The road to peace could go from deeds to discussions, or it could start with discussions and go to deeds.

We are ready to take either route or to move on both.

MUST KEEP TRUST

Reciprocity must be the fundamental principle of any reduction in hostilities. The United States cannot and will not reduce its activities unless and until there is some reduction on the other side. To follow any other rule would be to violate the sacred trust we undertake when we ask a man to risk his life for his country.

We will negotiate a reduction of the bombing whenever the government of North Vietnam is ready and there are almost innumerable avenues of communication by which the government of North Vietnam can make their readiness known.

To this date there has been no sign of that readiness.

Yet, we must and will keep trying.

As I speak to you today, Secretary Rusk and our representatives throughout the world are on constant alert. Hundreds of quiet diplomatic conversations have been held far from the glare of front page headlines and Kleig lights and will be held on the possibilities of bringing peace to Vietnam.

Gov. Harriman, with 25 years of experience of troubleshooting on the most difficult international problems, is carrying out my instructions that every lead, however slight it may first appear, from any source, public or private, shall be followed up.

Let me conclude by saying this: I wish so much it were within my power to assure that all those in Hanoi could hear one simple message—America is committed to the defense of South Vietnam until an honorable peace can be negotiated.

If this one communication gets through and its rational implications are drawn, we should be at the table tomorrow. It would be none too soon. Then hundreds of thousands of Americans—as brave as any who ever took the field for their country—can return to their homes. Then millions of Vietnamese can begin to make a decent life for themselves and their families without fear of terrorism or war or fear of communist enslavement. That is what we are working for. And we must not—shall not—will not fail.

Thank you.

Following the address to the Tennessee General Assembly, the President and Mrs. Johnson, accompanied by Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary John Gardner, traveled to Columbia, Tenn., for the dedication of Columbia State Community College. During the ceremonies, Secretary Gardner termed the development of the community college

as the greatest invention in 20th-century education.

Later that evening the President, Mrs. Johnson, and Secretary Gardner returned to Nashville for an education seminar held at the Governor's mansion and hosted by Gov. and Mrs. Buford Ellington.

All in all, March 15, 1967, was a historic day for Nashville and Tennessee, one which all Tennesseans can be justly proud of.

There was in connection with the trip, however, an incident which pointed to a need for legislative attention.

Several days prior to the arrival of the First Family two men were taken into custody in Nashville for questioning in connection with stories of an alleged plot concerning the First Lady. No charges were brought and no arrests made.

However, the situation brought attention to the fact that the Federal authorities have no legal jurisdiction over crimes against or conspiracy to commit crimes against the family of the President.

You will recall that at the time of the assassination of President Kennedy, the Federal Government had no jurisdiction over this type of crime.

That situation was eliminated with the passage of legislation in 1965. However, the family of the President was not included nor were members of the Cabinet.

Therefore, I am introducing legislation which would extend Federal jurisdiction to include these individuals under section 1751 of title XVIII, United States Code. Existing law under that code makes it a crime to conspire to kill or kidnap the President, President-elect, the Vice President, or, if there is no Vice President, the office next in order of succession to the office of President of the United States, the Vice-President-elect, or any individual who is acting as President under the Constitution and laws of the United States. Under section 1751(d) it is also a crime to conspire to kill or kidnap any individual listed in subsection (a).

The bill I am introducing would change the language of 1751(a) to read:

(a) Whoever kills any individual who is the President of the United States; the spouse, son or daughter of the President; the President-elect; the Vice President, or, if there is no Vice-President-elect, a member of the President's Cabinet; or any individual who is acting as President under the Constitution and laws of the United States;

We have never had need of this type legislation, to my knowledge, and we pray such authority is never needed. However, we discovered on November 22, 1963, how serious the then existing omission in Federal law was. There is still an omission and now is the time to remedy it.

EDWARD P. MORGAN AND THE NEWS

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, Edward P. Morgan, who is one of the Nation's most discerning and provocative news commentators, pointed out on a recent program, that brilliant, responsible people like Whitney Young, executive director of the National Urban League, are doing more to solve the problems of our metropolitan areas than the so-called activists who get the headlines.

Drastic steps must be taken without delay to halt the deterioration of our cities, Mr. Morgan warns, or "the damage to the country will have to be equated in terms that will cause historians to conclude that it might as well have been subjected to a nuclear attack."

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that those who did not hear this challenging broadcast, over the American Broadcasting Co. radio network, sponsored by the AFL-CIO, should have the opportunity to read Mr. Morgan's comment. I therefore include it in the RECORD, as follows:

EDWARD P. MORGAN AND THE NEWS

MARCH 16, 1967.

The United States presided over the invention of the atomic bomb and it is now presiding, negligently, over the preparation of another explosion which it must prevent if American cities are to be saved from sociological destruction. To compare the wartime devastation of Hiroshima and Nagasaki with the devastation threatening urban America may be called an inappropriate and downright reckless exaggeration. There may be parallels that are more apt. But I don't think it is an exaggeration to say that unless drastic measures are taken soon against the violent deterioration of the nation's metropolitan areas, the damage to the country will have to be equated in terms that will cause historians to conclude that it might as well have been subjected to a nuclear attack.

A volcanic series of race riots need not erupt in order to make that dour projection prophetic. The "inner city" is already dying and the mortal wound is more likely to be inflicted by careless neglect of the crisis than by the repetition of another holocaust like Watts. The problem is to awaken ourselves to the problem so that we may apply constructive intelligence in dealing with it, while there is still a little time. What is killing the city? A lot of things. Traffic jams. Air pollution. Waterways poisoned with sewage. Noise. Et cetera. Scientific planning can solve some if not all of these afflictions. The cost will be painfully high but it will be painfully higher the longer reforms are delayed.

What the scientists have not invented, however, is a way to deal with the most insidious defect of all, the problem within the problem—the segregated slum. There is a solution but its very simplicity only dramatizes the terrible complications which beset it. The solution is for people to live in neighborhoods instead of in enemy encampments. But this involves sacrificing the prejudices nurtured in ignorance and fear. And these dubious luxuries, so long clutched in the strongbox of emotion, are not easily given up. Yet if we study the situation a little more closely, what other alternative is there?

Here are some facts. In a speech in Washington today before a meeting of the Federal Bar Association, Whitney M. Young, Jr., executive director of the National Urban League, said that "quite simply, the action we take (or fail to take on these facts) in the immediate future . . . may well determine the fate of the republic." Today in America more people live in slums than live on farms. This reflects in part, an "explosive increase of the Negro population in northern, central

and western cities (which) represents one of the most dramatic social changes in urban history . . . In 1910 . . . 73 percent of all Negroes lived in rural areas. Today 73 percent of all Negroes live in cities. In just one decade New York City lost a middle class white population almost the size of Washington . . . and gained a non-white population almost the size of Pittsburgh."

The population of Washington, D.C. has been more than 50 percent Negro for nearly 10 years. Ten other major cities will shortly join that category. Newark, New Jersey, and Gary, Indiana, already have. Gary has one of the most menacing morasses of unsolved racial problems in the country.

No other ethnic group, Young reported, has ever made up so large a proportion of the population as does the Negro today—11 percent. But the urban Negro has become trapped in the ghetto as middle-class whites continue to flee to the de facto segregation of the suburbs, taking shopping centers, better schools, industry and tax revenue with them. The inner city is rapidly becoming a kind of ghost town, increasingly inhabited, you might say, by black ghosts.

A brilliant, responsible citizen, Young and his staff and supporters have built the Urban League into one of the most effective agencies in the land in breaching barriers against Negroes in the areas of jobs and housing. Ironically, like Roy Wilkins and the NAACP, both Young and the League have had their leadership at least temporarily discredited among the increasingly impatient Negro population as the white power structure failed to keep pace with the civil rights revolution and as young "activists" like Stokely Carmichael have drawn more and more headline attention. Never any real threat in itself, the terrible damage that the "black power" shibboleth has done, as New York Times Columnist Russell Baker so caustically notes, was to make bigotry respectable again.

But if the crisis of the city is to be solved (and this is the human crisis of America) black and white Americans alike must open their minds to the urgent reasonableness of men like Whitney Young, as they argue that massive, varied but coordinated efforts must be made in the ghetto to redeem or replace housing, make schools excellent and social services adequate, no matter what the composition of the population in the immediate or surrounding area, this year or next. The gap between the white and non-white population, Young warns, is not narrowing. It is widening. It will take responsible leadership on both sides to close it. The responsibility, in this case, is heavier with the haves than with the have-nots.

This is Edward P. Morgan saying good night from Washington.

FISCAL AND MONETARY QUESTIONS

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee I am, of course, intensely interested in all aspects of the fiscal and monetary questions that are deluging us lately.

Recently the distinguished Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation addressed himself to a most interesting and important development in the American banking world. I wish to compliment the Chairman on his sensi-

tivity to trends and insert the text of his remarks made recently before the National Installment Credit Conference of the American Bankers Association. Though we may not agree with everything said, I believe it is important that his ideas be given as wide circulation as possible.

Also, I insert another article of grave importance to us all, an article in the current ASTA Travel News:

REMARKS OF K. A. RANDALL, CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

The Federal deposit insurance system was authorized by Congress in 1933 during the Great Depression to protect depositors in banks and to help restore public confidence in our banking system. At the outset, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation was chiefly concerned with the rescue of failed or failing banks and resumption of normal banking activities. The sharp reduction of bank failures in the years following the Corporation's establishment in 1934 clearly evidences the success of the Corporation's efforts to achieve its major objective. Bank failures dropped from 4,000 bank closings in 1933 to an average of 54 per year in the 1934-42 period. Moreover, the Corporation's activities were—and still are—considered an important contribution to economic stability.

By the end of World War II, when the Employment Act was placed on the statute books, the Corporation's role was viewed narrowly as one of providing support for the banking system. Congressional hearings in 1949 conducted by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report included testimony by the Chairman of the Corporation that the purposes of deposit insurance were:

"To protect small depositors, to maintain the confidence of depositors in the banks, to raise standards of bank management and increase the soundness of the banking system, and to aid in protecting the circulating medium. Accomplishment of these purposes would contribute to economic and financial stability and thus serve to further the purposes of the Employment Act."

The Chairman also declared that since the Corporation was discharging these duties in accordance with its statutory authority it was "making a maximum contribution to furthering the purposes of the Employment Act."

The Corporation's purposes have not changed in essential respects from those described some 17½ years ago, but the environment in which the Corporation is operating today is significantly different—and, as a consequence, its orientation also has changed. The difference can be ascribed in large part to the impact of the Employment Act of 1946, which set forth the objectives of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

The Employment Act was significant primarily because it symbolized the nation's acceptance for the first time of the role that the Federal Government and its agencies could play in attaining the Act's objectives. Because the goals were phrased in general terms, moreover, they have not become outmoded with the years but instead have been broadened to include the objectives of price stability and steady growth, as well as balance in the nation's international accounts. As a symbol of a major shift in economic thinking, therefore, passage of the Employment Act of 1946 marked a strategic turning point in our history.

The recent steady progress toward attainment of the goals of the Employment Act has broadened our sphere of activities and responsibility. The changed environment has necessitated adoption of new ways of viewing problems and consideration of new ways of solving them. The change is one

of significant import for banks and other financial institutions as well as for bank supervisors.

The recent relative stability of the economy at high levels of employment and production, such as we have today, depends on the maintenance of full employment levels for its perpetuation. Under these circumstances, there is less margin for error in bank decisions and a greater need for flexibility in bank policies and practices in order to adapt to an economy operating close to capacity levels. Even if the problems currently encountered by the banking agencies are basically unchanged in nature, they are greater in magnitude, if not also in complexity, with the expansion of the economy and growth in the size of financial institutions. The responses of a bank supervisory agency such as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to these recent changes in the banking environment therefore must be more imaginative, more adaptable, and more precisely tailored to meet the particular situation and to anticipate future problems than ever before.

The steady postwar expansion in consumer installment credit and the recent spurt of activity in bank credit card plans provide a good example of a development that bank supervisory agencies such as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation face in a constantly changing environment. As the aims of the Employment Act approached realization, consumers became less reluctant to assume debt and commit future income for current consumption. They developed greater confidence in a continuing rise in income and employment and in the security of both jobs and income. Lenders likewise were more willing to extend credit to consumers as fluctuations in economic activity and in personal income were dampened. As banks became active in consumer credit financing, their policies and practices in this area as well as overall trends in consumer credit were increasingly of interest to bank supervisors.

Over the past 20 years, the dollar volume of consumer installment credit outstanding has risen spectacularly from \$4 billion at the end of 1946 to almost \$75 billion at the present time. The expansion occurred at a rapid yet fairly consistent rate, with only a few exceptions.

Commercial banks have been a prime factor in the growth of consumer financing. Your share of the consumer credit market has been increasing and now accounts for about half of consumer installment credit outstanding. Moreover, your activities in this field are more diversified than others extending credit to consumers and include direct lending to individuals for various purposes, the purchase of installment paper from retailers, and the financing of finance companies' and retailers' receivables. Commercial banks were responsible for more than 55 percent of the automobile credit outstanding at the end of January 1967, about one-fourth of the nonauto credit, one-third of the personal loans, and 70 percent of the repair and modernization loans. Small banks have been particularly active in auto financing; their auto loans have been rising much faster than similar loans at the medium-sized and large banks.

Expansion in the volume of consumer installment credit has contributed importantly to economic growth in this country. This innovation in the financing of consumer goods purchases has facilitated substantial improvements in the standard of living for most of our population, especially the lower income groups and young married couples just starting a household. Furthermore, it has been of great advantage to the smaller retailer and manufacturer. Of broad significance is the greater flexibility in timing accorded the consumer in the purchase of "big-ticket" items, which in turn helps to

dampen fluctuations in consumer spending and likewise in consumer durable goods production.

The postwar upsurge in the dollar volume of consumer credit can be attributed to a number of factors, aside from the technical change in payments methods. Evidence suggests, for example, that consumers are upgrading their purchases—buying better quality goods at higher prices. New demands have emerged for high-priced goods such as mobile homes and boats and for services such as travel and educational expenses. In addition, the financing of services on an installment basis has more than doubled in the last five years—a growth rate greater than for any other type of consumer installment credit. The increasingly widespread ownership of automobiles—the hallmark of an affluent society—has further added to the consumer credit totals. Possibly most important have been the increased willingness of consumers in the postwar period to incur debt and the proliferation of institutional facilities to extend consumer credit.

Since late 1965, the rate of increase in consumer installment credit has slackened to some extent. There has been some weakening in the demand for consumer credit as well as some diminution in the availability of loanable funds. The generally higher cost of money, however, was not fully reflected in consumer credit costs and therefore had only a minimal effect on the demand for consumer credit. Much of the current weakness in the demand for such credit may be ascribed to the slower pace of auto sales.

The recent behavior of consumer installment lending has prompted questions about its impact on consumer spending in particular and on economic activity in general. Once again, questions have been posed with regard to the aggregate volume of consumer installment credit and its sustainability. To be sure, the tapering off in the demand for automobiles is not wholly unexpected after three consecutive record sales years. Viewed in perspective, the fact that consumer installment credit extensions and therefore consumer spending were less buoyant was not a wholly adverse development since our economy had been operating for a prolonged period close to capacity levels.

Looking at the level of consumer installment credit over a longer period, there is little to indicate that the present levels of consumer debt are excessive or that the economy is approaching a ceiling for this type of credit. The ratio of repayments on consumer credit to disposable income rose to a postwar high of 14.5 percent in the first quarter of 1966 but subsequently eased to 14.3 percent by the final quarter of last year. However, the decline in this ratio since early 1966 can hardly be viewed as evidence of credit saturation.

No doubt a number of consumers have incurred progressively heavier debt burdens over the years. But there has also been a significant increase in the number of consumers making commitments for the first time. For example, the number of households under 25 years of age has been steadily rising. This is the age group where the need for consumer goods typically exceeds ability to pay out of current income and where there is the greatest use of installment financing. In addition, changes in forms of payment, such as the substitution of installment credit for the more traditional forms of financing, were also a factor.

Within the field of consumer credit, a relatively new development has lately been attracting much of the attention of banks and bank supervisory agencies—bank credit cards. A number of banks in the Midwest are currently engaged, for example, in introducing credit card plans to the region. In addition, there are other banks in the area working on a cooperative basis with others

in the development of nationwide interchangeable credit card systems.

The credit card plans in effect have a large number of variants, which I will not take the time to describe. But they can be roughly classified into bank credit card plans, check-credit plans, and what might be termed the overdraft-travelers' check plan. All these plans differ as to details, organization, and geographical coverage, but they all generally feature granting of a line of revolving credit to the consumer. The bank credit card plans, in addition, involve financing of the merchant retailer. The plans are local, regional, or national in coverage.

Bank credit cards, however, are not a brand-new development. The first bank credit card plan was introduced in 1951. The subsequent history of bank credit cards is checkered and their development proceeded in "fits and starts," with brief periods of renewed interest in 1953 and again in 1959. Many of the banks that entered the field in those years dropped out because of unfavorable experiences. High start-up costs for equipment, personnel, and advertising; inability to sustain losses in the initial years of operation; and inadequate advance planning also took their toll.

In 1965, however, bank interest revived, and the number of banks adopting plans grew rapidly. Improved profit prospects—due in part of least to the cost-reducing potentialities of a computerized operation—have probably been the major factor in the resumption of bank activity in this area. At the present time, it is estimated that there are around 1,000 banks with some type of credit card arrangement; about three-fourths of this total is concentrated in the four-state region of Illinois, Michigan, Indiana, and Wisconsin.

Of greater significance than the details of individual plans are the implications that bank credit cards and related plans hold for the economy as a whole, for the financial system, and for the payments mechanism. Bank credit cards are also of obvious concern to the supervisors of financial institutions, the consumer, the retailers, and, of course, the banks themselves—whether or not they establish or participate in a credit card plan.

The bank credit card has been hailed as the forerunner of the checkless and cashless society of the future. Whether the present plans will actually evolve in that direction remains to be seen. The payments mechanism of the future could develop an entirely different orientation. Since that possibility does not seem imminent, we might more profitably concern ourselves today with some of the immediate problems and practical ramifications that confront the bank supervisory authorities in the spread of bank credit card plans. I am not going to attempt to offer solutions but only pose questions. The answers will require careful thought and more experience.

Bank credit cards can have an impact, for example, on the proportion of consumer spending based on credit and on current patterns of consumer spending and saving. More purchases might be made on credit and more of current income spent. As a consequence, personal savings patterns could undergo some basic changes, and the flow of individual savings to financial intermediaries could be sharply curtailed. Bank financing of business might be adversely affected if the traditional avenues for channeling funds from individuals to business through the intermediation of banks are disrupted. Monetary policy actions, moreover, would have to take into account the possibility of offsetting actions by credit card holders to credit restraint.

The use of bank credit cards also has broad implications for an individual bank's competitive situation vis-à-vis other banks and those nonbank financial institutions offering consumer credit facilities. Success of

bank credit cards and related plans could divert an increasing share of the consumer credit business to banks and thus strengthen the competitive position of banks in this expanding field. On the other hand, the profit potentialities in the credit card area have already encouraged nonbank credit card plans to establish joint ventures with banks, while some of the large, diversified businesses with substantial retail and financing activities may also decide to enter the credit card business themselves.

Further development of the credit card business could result in significant shifts in the composition of bank loan portfolios, with consumer credit increasing in importance. The interchangeable card systems that utilize correspondent banking relationships—as here in the Midwest—could also have important implications for bank structure. These possibilities indicate just a few of the broad industry issues and the financial ramifications posed by credit card plans for bank supervisors.

The operations of an individual bank may be significantly affected by its participation or nonparticipation in a bank credit card or related plan. For a bank contemplating participation in an existing plan or establishment of its own credit card plan, the decision should be based only on a careful consideration and assessment of all factors involved. Costs must be weighed against the benefits that the bank expects to realize from introduction of a credit card plan.

Bank management must make a number of major operating and policy decisions. In the first place, are the bank's customers—both actual and prospective—receptive to the introduction of bank credit cards and in need of additional credit facilities of this type? Past experience indicates that a large volume of transactions is needed to support a profitable operation. If pressures to achieve a volume operation are too great, there is some danger of a deterioration in credit quality.

Secondly, is a credit card plan essential to the bank from a competitive viewpoint alone? The larger the number of competitors engaging in the bank credit card business, the smaller is the competitive advantage of any single institution. Nevertheless, promotion of this type of activity could divert substantial credit business from large retailing firms that currently maintain their own credit departments. Such an outcome would be somewhat similar to the situation that developed when banks successfully introduced the large, negotiable certificate of deposit and attracted a sizeable volume of corporate funds away from the money market. Additional business could be developed also from a shifting of a larger proportion of a small retailer's sales to a credit basis. One byproduct would also be the opening-up of new sources of bank income and increased potential markets for sale of other bank services.

Competitive pressures "to keep up with the times" could overwhelm a smaller bank especially and lead to its involvement in a credit card plan before it fully realized the extent of the costs and burdens assumed. Therefore, it is most important that a detailed review of the pros and cons of bank credit cards be undertaken before a decision is made. Will the bank, for instance, be able to bear the heavy start-up costs in terms of equipment, personnel, and advertising needed to launch such a plan? Is the institution able to sustain losses for several years until the break-even point is reached? On the other hand, franchises should not be purchased merely to forestall competition.

Not only must these initial decisions be made, but bank management must remain aware of many other important implications of bank credit card plans for bank operations. A bank, for instance, might be able to estimate fairly accurately the maximum poten-

tial demand for credit under its credit card plan, but the use of these credit facilities could vary sharply from month to month as well as seasonally. Consequently, a bank's liquidity requirements might have to be modified to accommodate possible new demands on its liquidity position. The intensity of usage could also vary inversely with changes in monetary policy as more holders use their credit lines in a period of credit restraint, thus adding to pressures on a bank. Because the profitability of a bank credit card operation depends, moreover, only on the spread between costs and income without the added mark-up which is available to the retailer, a bank has a narrower margin in which to absorb credit losses. High credit standards are therefore even more important for banks than for retailers offering consumer credit.

Bank credit cards and related plans hold both promise and pitfalls for banks. Greater stability of consumer spending through the spreading out of consumer purchases over time has undoubtedly contributed to economic growth and to a more dependable yet expanding demand for bank credit. Although there are risks in moving into the credit card field—as in any new venture, the opening of this market to banks appears to offer increased opportunities to serve the convenience and needs of the public. It offers new challenges as well as new problems for banks and bank supervisory agencies.

No matter what the problem or the challenge—whether bank credit cards, consumer credit in general, or some other development in the financial sector—the imperatives of the new environment necessitate a continuous re-examination of old policies and practices by banks and bank supervisors. The banking industry as well as the supervisory authorities must be willing to consider new policies and approaches and to abandon or modify old policies and practices when deficiencies are discovered to exist. Only through such a continuous selecting and sorting process can worthwhile financial innovations be tested for their value in the further development of our financial system.

The responsibility to initiate innovations does not rest with bank supervisors—but with bank management. As bank supervisors we do not want to inhibit innovation, but it is also our clear duty to indicate to banks the difficulties as well as the opportunities as they enter new fields of activity.

[From ASTA Travel News, March 1967]
AGENTS OPPOSE BANK COMPETITION IN
BAY STATE

Last November the South Shore National Bank in Massachusetts announced the purchase of Wellesley Travel Service, the fourth largest travel agency in New England.

It meant that for the first time a bank in Massachusetts was to engage, as ASTA put it, "in this form of nonbanking activity."

The announcement and subsequent advertising by the bank touched off an immediate protest from local agents who felt that the bank was about to engage "on the unfair competitive footing with independent travel agencies."

The president of Wellesley Travel Service, Charles F. Heartfield, 43, who joined the bank as a Vice President, once served on ASTA's Board of Directors and as President of the New England Chapter.

Wouldn't any travel agent with the same opportunity do the same thing? Heartfield inquired last month.

ASTA's contention, as put before the House Subcommittee on Bank Supervision and Insurance a year ago, is, "Congress never intended that national banks should be allowed to engage in the commercial travel business."

ASTA maintains there should be a limit to banks' *ultra-vires* operations and said that,

if their travel activities are not curbed, the "entire existence of the independent travel agency may be at stake."

The banks, on the other hand, argue that some of them have been in the travel business since 1872, and have not put anybody out of business. Indeed, they say, they provide the financial stability, prestige and favorable image for travel bureaus that ASTA seeks.

The threat of banks, however, is a live-wire concern to agents who find them opening down the street or next door.

"What is a bank doing in my business?" an agent may ask. "I cannot enter theirs."

UNFAIR COMPETITION?

Aside from that, travel agents may wonder, do banks provide unfair competition? Do they overpower smaller agents with high-powered advertising? Or do they enlarge the travel market with their strong promotional activities?

The South Shore National Bank announcement also served to focus on the possible threat that local travel agencies could be numerically outplayed by bank bureaus.

Here's the reason: once a national bank opens a travel bureau, state banks invariably seek to compete. In New York last year, the state legislature passed a law to permit this. After the South Shore announcement, a similar bill went into the Massachusetts legislature.

In Massachusetts, agents sensed this threat of sizable competition. South Shore National Bank alone has 27 branches. In addition, agents claimed, the bank advertised in such a manner as to indicate "unfair competition." For it implied that its banking and travel activities were serving each other.

ASTA immediately complained to Abraham J. Multer, Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Bank Supervision and Insurance.

In a letter, ASTA charged that the bank had launched "upon a massive advertising program in an apparent effort to capture virtually all of the travel agency business in those areas in which the Bank's 27 branches operate."

"The high-powered and expensive promotional program undertaken by the South Shore National Bank graphically illustrates the threats to small independent travel agents which accompany the uncontrolled entry by banks into the travel agency business."

Mr. Heartfield denied it was "high-powered and expensive," and said that thus far the total advertising was less than his own agency had done in the same three months last year.

"I'm not saying this will continue, though," he added.

"All told," he said, "five branches are planned. On the other hand, he pointed out, there are 212 travel agencies in the state."

In its letter to Multer, ASTA also pointed to newspaper reports and advertising copy which indicated:

"1. The bank is operating through the physically separate facilities of the Wellesley Travel Service and is advertising that 'travel-minded families and firms can now make all of their financial arrangements right at Wellesley Travel Service, a new department of the bank.' (*Dover Reporter*, page 12, December 15, 1966)."

Heartfield last month said Wellesley Travel Service would remain in separate facilities until the bank is renovated to accommodate its travel department. "The bank is up the street."

"All financial arrangements?" By this, he said, "we mean, 'you can fly now, pay later.' Any agency, airline or transportation company advertises this if it's a good one."

MISLEADING ADVERTISING

ASTA said this advertising "would appear to indicate that members of the public are being encouraged to conduct banking trans-

actions at an unauthorized banking location, i.e., the Wellesley Travel Service."

"2. The Bank has advertised that the former employees of Wellesley Travel Service have now become bankers. (*Dover Reporter*, p. 12, December 15, 1966.)"

Heartfield: "Employees of banks are bankers."

"3. The bank is using its substantial financial facilities and prestige to attract customers to its travel department. In advertising a particular promotion, the Bank has stated: 'Round trip by plane or bus. Hotel, bonus book, shows and all the tickets you'll need to enjoy Expo 67—plus—\$100 spending money!' (*The Patriot Ledger*, p. 6, January 6, 1967.)"

Heartfield said the advertisement was run in connection with the opening of the Bank's Quincy branch travel bureau. The trip to Expo 67 was a prize in a drawing. We decided to give \$100 for expenses.

"We do not give them loans. That's another department of the bank."

"That we're using our substantial financial facilities and prestige—is that bad?"

"4. The Bank is reported to have rented at least seven roadside billboards, for which it has paid approximately \$300 a month. In addition, it is engaged in large-scale advertising on a continuing basis in more than eight newspapers in Massachusetts. (This information was in a letter from Jerome J. Pastene, President of Travel Trust Tours, Inc.)"

Heartfield said the bank has rented only two billboards and its advertising included some small newspapers with circulations as low as 2,000.

CALLS FOR INVESTIGATION

ASTA called on Representative Multer to launch an investigation. It invited his Subcommittee to ask the Comptroller of the Currency:

(1) What authorization preceded the acquisition of the South Shore National Bank of Wellesley Travel Service.

(2) What control, if any, does the Comptroller of the Currency maintain over this bank's travel activities and the "rather questionable advertising indicating the availability of banking facilities at the separate facilities of the bank?"

ASTA pointed out to Rep. Multer that as a member of the House Select Committee on Small Business, he can appreciate "the need to strengthen and preserve a healthy atmosphere, for the travel agent industry."

"The actions of the South Shore National Banks do not tend to create this atmosphere, and in fact, seriously jeopardize the objectives and recommendations which the Small Business Committee has made in its report."

The New England Chapter, meanwhile, began a campaign to prevent banks from offering travel services.

It will institute action in the U.S. District Court of Massachusetts against the U.S. Comptroller of the Currency on the grounds the Wellesley Travel Service acquisition is "illegal and improper."

It will also fight the legislation to permit state banks to offer travel services.

ASTA's Executive Committee voted to share the costs involved.

STIFFER PENALTIES CAN CURB GROWING GUN CRIME RATE

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, severe

mandatory penalties—swiftly invoked—can end the growing problem of criminal use of firearms in our country.

This Congress can no longer stand by and see the threat to our national welfare growing at a prodigious rate each year, without taking affirmative action.

For many days, I have attempted to inform my colleagues of all aspects of the problem surrounding the illegal use of firearms—and the ineffectiveness of some of the proposals put forth to solve it. I have advised them of the need and the justification for legislation such as H.R. 360 and H.R. 6137 which I authored, to set a mandatory 10-year sentence for use or possession of firearms during commission of major crimes of violence on first offense, and 25 years on a subsequent offense.

The only deterrent to crime for the hardened felon is severe punishment. Those idealists who look for the day when every criminal will come out of the penitentiary fully rehabilitated to take his productive place in Utopia are refusing to face the facts of life. The people of America know this, and that the time has come to stop playing games with criminals.

Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, one of the greatest experts in criminology the world has known, stated:

Coddling criminals and soft justice increase crime; denials to the contrary have no valid support. Yet, these truths are still lost in the maze of sympathy and leniency heaped upon the criminal. Lame excuses and apologies offered for the lawbreaker are exceeded only by the amount of violence he commits. Meantime, law-abiding people who have a right to expect protection from criminals have this right abused and ignored.

How long, Mr. Speaker, will Congress continue to ignore the rights of the people to live free from the fear of robbery, rape, and murder?

Those words I just cited were written by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and were taken from his "Message From the Director" in the March FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin. It is an excellent message, and I know it will strike a responsive chord in the hearts of all Americans, and in particular, with those dedicated men and women who serve in our law enforcement agencies. I commend Mr. Hoover for his message, and urge my colleagues to give his words of wisdom careful study:

MESSAGE FROM THE DIRECTOR

Could it be that 1967 will be remembered as the year the American people demanded respect for law and order and a halt to rising crime in our country?

While this hope may not fully materialize, there are some promising symptoms of growing public concern. In many areas, citizens are genuinely alarmed, and rightly so, by increasing criminal violence. Indications are that more and more people want effective enforcement of the law and realistic punishment of those who break it. Federal, State, and local governments are initiating new and broader programs to aid law enforcement and to provide better training and equipment for the enforcement officer. Civic and patriotic groups are rallying to support police and are calling for citizens to obey the law and to help prosecute those who refuse to obey it. These are encouraging signs.

Actually, the American public is seeking,

and sorely needs, a proven formula to deter crime. The people are growing tired of substitutes. Swift detection and apprehension, prompt prosecution, and proper and certain punishment are tested crime deterrents. As we have seen, however, this combination of deterrents can be ineffective because of breakdowns in one or all of its phases. That is why we cannot expect high-quality police service alone to bring full relief from the crime problem. If the hardened criminal is arrested but not punished, he is not long deterred from his criminal pursuits.

One State supreme court justice recently stated that it is completely unrealistic to say that punishment is not a deterrent to crime. "It is simply contrary to human nature," the justice explained, "not to be deterred from a course of action by the threat of punishment." This is the kind of reasoning and straight talk that makes sense to both the public and law enforcement. It is a refreshing contrast to the weak theories which rationalize criminal behavior and make villains of all policemen.

Coddling of criminals and soft justice increase crime; denials to the contrary have no valid support. Yet, these truths are still lost in the maze of sympathy and leniency heaped upon the criminal. Lame excuses and apologies offered for the lawbreaker are exceeded only by the amount of violence he commits. Meantime, law-abiding people who have a right to expect protection from criminals have this right abused and ignored.

Certainly, the American public must soon take positive action to curtail crime and violence. Good intentions are worthless. Funds for better law enforcement will help, but will not do the complete job. Community and civic authorities, educators, religious leaders, and prominent men and women from all walks of life must speak out, demand justice for law-abiding citizens, and unite the people in a forceful campaign against crime. There is nothing wrong with the clergy's warning against excessive compassion for the criminal at the expense of innocent victims. There is nothing wrong with educators' denouncing rabble rousers and agitators who disrupt the orderly processes of the academic community and defy authority. And there is nothing wrong with community and city officials' crusading to rid their streets of thugs, rapists, and robbers.

Law enforcement, of course, is gratified with the great strides that have been made in the profession in recent years. It is also appreciative of new efforts to make its fight against crime more effective. Law enforcement will take full advantage of all aid and assistance and meet its obligations with a determination to give the public adequate protection. Let the public remember, however, that detecting and apprehending criminals are not the whole answer. The criminal must know that his destiny also includes prompt prosecution and substantial punishment.

—JOHN EDGAR HOOVER, Director.

TRIBUTE TO A GREAT TEXAS PUBLISHER, HUMANITARIAN, AND PUBLIC BENEFACTOR, CARL L. ESTES

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I call the attention of

this body to a further distinction now accorded to a truly remarkable person, Carl L. Estes, of Longview, Gregg County, Tex. By personal observation over the years, a friendship which spans half a century, and through our association in numerous constructive projects, I well know that he is a dedicated and effective publisher, humanitarian, and public benefactor, ranking among the most notable ever produced by our Nation. On March 13, the Texas Legislature and the Gregg County commissioners court honored Carl Estes with unanimous resolutions officially designating a major thoroughfare as Estes Parkway. This unique honor is entirely fitting for a gentleman of such unparalleled accomplishments. As reported in the Longview Morning Journal on March 13 and March 15, 1967, respectively, the following articles set forth the interesting historical detail of the resolutions which record this signal honor to a distinguished Texan, Carl L. Estes, of Longview:

ESTES PARKWAY NAMED ON HIGHWAY 149
(By S. A. Parker, Ellie Hopkins, and Dick Sands)

The Texas Legislature and Gregg County Commissioners Court adopted unanimously Monday separate but identical resolutions which officially designated as "Estes Parkway" that section of Highway 149 extending from the Longview city limits southward to Highway 322 just southeast of the Sabine river bridge.

The action of the three bodies was in honor of Carl L. Estes, publisher of the Longview Morning Journal and The Longview Daily News and other publications and who has been a pioneer in the industrial development of East Texas and in the development of the Sabine river.

Gregg County Judge Henry Atkinson, who originated the project, said the Texas Highway Department has given approval of the plan and is cooperating in its execution.

"To my knowledge, this is the first time that a state public highway has been named and designated as this one has; also, the action taken by the Senate and the House of Representatives is a precedent," Judge Atkinson said.

"This action is a coordinated effort between the Gregg County Commissioners Court, Senator Jack Strong, Rep. John Allen, and the State Highway Department has been most cooperative and helpful," said Judge Atkinson.

The veteran publisher, visibly shaken when informed personally by County Judge Henry Atkinson of the court's action and upon being told of the unanimous vote of approval of the state Legislature, said:

"It is impossible for me to express in words at this time my deep humility and gratitude to all those who have given me this unprecedented honor—the greatest ever paid to me in my 70 years of life. I am filled with humbleness. In my heart I feel the deepest gratitude. All I can find voice to say is, 'I am humbly grateful'."

Members of the House of Representatives, at the request of Rep. Allen of Longview and with concurrence of House Speaker Ben Barnes, unanimously voted to suspend the rules and pass the resolution without dissent. It was introduced as House Resolution No. 176.

Under normal House procedure, such measures are referred to a special committee before floor action, but in this case, according to Allen, members conversant with the role the Longview publisher has filled in developing East Texas, took direct floor action.

In the Senate, where the proposal was introduced by Sen. Jack Strong of Longview

as Senate Resolution No. 242, approval also was unanimous.

A member of the senator's staff said that in cases of such resolutions, committee action was not required and for that reason direct action by the full Senate was possible.

In both of the resolutions, context with that approved by the Gregg County commissioners court was preserved; the only changes being in the last paragraph where the words "House of Representatives" and "Senate" were substituted for "Gregg County Commissioners Court."

Judge Atkinson said at least 10 attractive signs bearing the "Estes Parkway" designation will be erected along the 2.5-mile section of highway. Each sign will be approximately 24 x 18 inches in size, with white letters on a green background. The signs will have a fluorescent finish so they can easily be seen at night.

The full text of the resolution naming and designating the "Estes Parkway" follows:

"Whereas, the Honorable Carl Estes, Publisher, Longview Daily News and Morning Journal, has given unselfishly and unstintingly of his time, talent, resources, and labor to the development, improvement and edification of Gregg County; and

"Whereas, the said Carl L. Estes has achieved state and nation-wide recognition for significant contribution in the journalistic and philanthropic fields; and

"Whereas, Gregg County has greatly benefited from the efforts of the said Carl L. Estes, particularly in the field of industrial development, and the industrial development and increasing importance of Gregg County as a distribution, marketing and industrial center, stands as a testimonial to his perseverance and dedication; and

"Whereas, the recognition that the said Carl Estes and his works have achieved reflects favorably upon Gregg County as a whole; and

"Whereas, Gregg County and its citizens are justly indebted to and appropriately proud of its foremost citizen, the said Carl L. Estes, for his achievements in behalf of the County;

"Now, therefore, in grateful recognition of this distinguished gentleman and his accomplishments, the Gregg County Commissioners Court unanimously makes the following Resolution:

"Be it resolved that that portion of State Highway 149 extending from the point of the Longview city limits south to the intersection with State Highway 322 be, and the same is hereby, named and designated as Estes Parkway."

BY UNANIMOUS VOTE—ESTES PARKWAY IS EXTENDED A MILE
(By Wells Burton)

Estes Parkway, which was created Monday by the Gregg County Commissioners Court and the Texas Legislature, and named in honor of Publisher Carl L. Estes, was extended by one mile Tuesday night as a result of a unanimous vote of the Longview City Commission at its regular monthly meeting.

As first named and designated, the parkway extended from the city limits south to the intersection of State Highway 149 and State Highway 322. With the addition of a mile from the present city limits northward to the Mobberly Avenue and High Street intersection, it now covers a distance of three and one-half miles.

By its action, the city commission brought the parkway to a point in front of R. G. Le-Tourneau, Inc., the first heavy industry brought to Longview by the publisher.

The section of Highway 149 which has been named and designated as Estes Parkway will now stand as a memorial to the man who played the leading role in the development of the huge industrial complex which is served by this roadway.

The response to the plan of honoring the publisher in this manner was tremendous.

It received a unanimous vote by the county commissioners court, the Texas Senate and House, the city commission, and was given the full support of the Texas Highway Department.

Legislative rules were suspended Monday morning so that the House and Senate could vote on the resolution commending the publisher and creating the parkway.

Longview Commissioner D. A. Benton moved that the Highway 149 segment be designated Estes Parkway and Commissioner James S. Witt seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

CONGRESS SHOULD AMEND NDEA TO INCLUDE HEALTH, PHYSICAL EDUCATION, AND RECREATION

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MEEDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, in the intriguing annals of science fiction, one can occasionally run across a particularly peculiar type of being: the superintelligent creature with an overdeveloped cranium which contrasts sharply with his spindly and shriveled body. His existence is happy and prosperous because, we are told tolerantly, he has developed a society that no longer requires brutish physical strength.

I would not want to argue the "what might be" of science fiction where imagination is the only limit on the possible. But, I wonder if we do not sometimes subconsciously make an assumption similar to the theme of those stories. We are learning more. We are gaining more control over our environment. In the process, our need for sheer physical strength is reduced. But, we should not confuse what may be the reduced need for brawn with the continuing need for good health, and strong, vigorous physical well-being.

The mind and the body function together and evidence is growing every year that the mind cannot function at its best in a body that has turned flabby from neglect and soft from disuse.

The health, physical education, and recreation programs of our schools play a vital role in developing the strong, intelligent, alert young people upon which our country will depend in the years to come. As we place increasing importance on our schools and their academic program, we must also give proper consideration to the physical needs and health education of our children.

There are some rather startling statistics I would like to point out briefly:

In 40 percent of the States, less than three-fourths of the elementary school children have regular instruction in health education.

In 60 percent of the States, less than three-fourths of the junior high school students have regular instruction in health education.

In 70 percent of the States, less than three-fourths of the senior high school students have regular instruction in health education.

Almost two-thirds of our States say

they urgently need additional teaching materials to improve the quality of the health education, physical education, and recreation programs. Not a single State reported their materials or equipment was adequate for quality instruction in these areas.

Eighty-five percent of our States report inadequate health instruction equipment and materials in 25 percent or more of their schools.

Eighty-five percent of our elementary teachers are not fully qualified to teach physical education in the elementary schools.

Forty percent of our high school physical education teachers need additional training to be fully qualified for their assignments.

Many of the people who have not participated in the in-service training have given as their reason the lack of sufficient funds to provide for a growing family and to pay for the high cost of tuition currently being charged for graduate study.

I am today introducing a bill to amend title III and title XI of the National Defense Education Act. These amendments will help encourage health, physical education, and recreation, just as the National Defense Education Act has stimulated academic progress.

The Congress has been urged to "amend the present national defense educational law so as to provide long needed assistance to the States to foster excellence in physical education." Vice President HUMPHREY recommended this in 1962, and I am pleased to sponsor legislation that seeks to make this suggestion a reality.

Just as it is important that our Nation meet its obligation to the development and training of children's intellectual capacities, it is also our obligation to assure their proper health and physical development.

The legislation I am sponsoring has two features. The first would amend title III of the National Defense Education Act to provide financial encouragement for classroom instruction in health, physical education, and recreation. No Federal money would be spent for athletic equipment. The second provision would amend title XI. This section would be revised so that regular session or short-term instruction would be available to those now teaching or planning to teach school health, physical education and recreation.

By amending titles III and XI of the National Defense Education Act, we can promote this needed health education and can move forward to attune our physical capabilities to the strenuous requirements of the 1960's. We can follow the example set and the goal urged by President Kennedy when he resolved that:

By keeping physical fitness in the forefront of the Nation's concerns, the Federal Government can make a substantial contribution toward improving the health and vigor of our citizens.

PROJECT HEADSTART

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most impressive educational innovations of our era is Project Headstart. Headstart represents in practice what educators have been preaching about for years. Headstart provides food for children who often scrape through their formative years on one skimpy meal a day; it limits the teacher-student ratio to 1 to 15; it includes the imaginative use of teacher aids in the classroom; and it stresses developing the creativity and imagination of our disadvantaged young, rather than trying to cram them into a preconceived and inadequate educational mold. An extreme example of the reaction to this approach was given in the January 31, 1967, report of the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children—set up by Congress to check on the progress being made under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Reports the Council:

In a city of the Middle West, our consultant-observer was chatting with a first grade teacher about children who had been passed on to her from a Headstart class. The teacher declared, "These children just won't settle down and sit still. They think school should be fun, and it's taken us all fall to get that out of them."

Similarly, the New York Citizens Committee for Children in a report entitled "Citizens Committee for Children Looks at Title I Prekindergarten Programs," dated October 28, 1966, states:

We were told that the pre-kindergarten children are regarded as too lively, curious, and irrepressible (i.e., troublesome) in a more formal school situation.

A very sad commentary, indeed, on the present state of early education in our Nation. I should like at this time, Mr. Speaker, to introduce into the Record two articles on Project Headstart which speak to this question. One by Gerald Grant in the March 1967 Progressive, entitled "Headstart: Not Enough"; and the other by Charles S. Carleton in the September 1966 American Education, entitled "Headstart or False Start?"

[From Progressive magazine, March 1967]

HEADSTART: NOT ENOUGH

(By Gerald Grant)

"Americans are such manic depressives. First Head Start was a brilliant success. Now it's a complete failure."

Thus did a high official in the Johnson Administration ruefully sum up the prevailing mood about what was once billed as the brightest victory of the War on Poverty.

The manic feelings about Head Start grew out of early and somewhat inflated claims about what the program had accomplished. The depression set in this winter when long-term evaluations became public confirming what some skeptics had feared in the beginning: that for many children it would be a fast Head Start and a quick finish as the educational and health benefits were washed away through lack of follow-through.

Spurred by the depressing research findings, President Johnson has given Head Start follow-through programs high priority

in the Ninetieth Congress. To keep the momentum of the Federal preschool program moving into the early elementary school grades, the Administration has proposed a \$135 million "Follow-Through" program.

Nearly two years ago, when Head Start was just getting off the ground, Dr. Martin Deutsch, one of the nation's leading experts on preschool education, warned of the unhappy consequences of the lack of follow-through. As director of the Institute for Developmental Studies, now affiliated with New York University, Dr. Deutsch had run for several years, in Harlem and the Lower East Side of New York, a number of successful demonstrations of what could be done for youngsters in the slums if their schooling were begun at age three. Deutsch was highly skeptical about Head Start, and he said so in a memorandum dated March 18, 1965, that was circulated in the Administration:

"Operation Head Start is an 'instant' program with wonderful, wholly acceptable objectives," Deutsch wrote, "but one which has not been, as yet, sufficiently thought through, planned for, or effectively organized. Big objectives require money, but they also require more than just money."

"What we need desperately is long-range planning, research, and model experimentation in order to anticipate the problems of school organization with relationship to these children throughout their school experience, and to plan programs on every grade level."

"We must be concerned with what will happen to the children after their preschool experience, and therefore must engage in systematic attempts to plan programs for them. There is some evidence that children who do get a 'head start' which has no follow-up momentum will return to their original failure levels."

"It is even possible," Deutsch concluded, "that some children will be so disappointed with the contrast between their original experiences in a rich environment, and the typical slum schools to which they graduate, that their performance levels will deteriorate further."

But there was then an almost fanatical fervor in Washington about Head Start. The pace was so frantic that teachers who were on the substitute teaching lists for the District of Columbia's public schools received calls as late as ten p.m. one night asking them to report the next morning to War on Poverty headquarters to review applications for Head Start grants that were pouring in from all parts of the country. To speed things up even more, college students and other part-time employees boarded planes on Friday afternoons, their briefcases packed with Head Start application forms, and winged to local outposts of the anti-poverty war to talk to church groups and school officials about putting in a bid to open a Head Start center.

Launched that spring of 1965 with the goal of reaching 100,000 four to six-year-olds, Head Start snowballed so rapidly that by summer's end more than 560,000 children were enrolled for six and eight week sessions. The creation of such a huge national program in six months was no small achievement and one which few believed could have been duplicated through traditional school channels.

Glowing tributes to the beneficent educational effects of Head Start were not long in coming.

Children were tested at the beginning and end of their Head Start experience. The results showed that with a lively curriculum, sympathetic care, and small classes (one teacher or aide for every five children), youngsters could make surprising gains on standardized intelligence tests. Gains ranged from eight up to an occasional nineteen points, enough to boost children from the so-called "dull normal" I.Q. of about

ninety to the middle or average range of nearly 100, though usually short of the scores most middle-class children enter school with.

Now, however, research findings have come to light confirming all too clearly what Deutsch had predicted two years earlier. The following findings indicate that the quick intellectual gains were wiped out as children moved into the more typical watered down kindergarten and first grade programs:

In Camden, New Jersey, children who were enrolled in an eight-week Head Start program scored no higher at the end of the kindergarten year than other deprived children who had not been enrolled in Head Start.

Baltimore's Head Start program was rated one of the best in the country, yet a follow-up study disclosed that children's intellectual gains declined as the year progressed, although they maintained a small lead in vocabulary skills. The Baltimore study, by David A. Wallers and C. Keith Connors of the Johns Hopkins University of Medicine, concluded that "without an attempt to maintain the benefits acquired from such a program, the opportunity for instituting significant and enduring changes will not be realized, and the promise of the head start afforded these children will go unfulfilled."

Max Wolff and Annie Stein of Yeshiva University found in their study of New York City Head Start children that academic gains disappeared six to eight months later although some of the "social and emotional" benefits remained.

Professor Urie Bronfenbrenner, an expert in child development research at Cornell University, challenges some of the conclusions drawn by these researchers, based upon a close analysis of the data they have gathered. He argues that "we do not yet have the data proving conclusively that Head Start benefits fade away." Bronfenbrenner says there are some indications that when Head Start youngsters enter good middle-class kindergartens, the gains are maintained. But he observes that it is highly probable that gains will fade if Head Start youngsters graduate to crowded kindergarten classrooms in the slums.

As unsettling to some as the lack of educational follow-through has been the spotty treatment of medical and dental ills uncovered by Head Start.

About ninety per cent of all children in Head Start had a medical examination. Physicians found an exceptionally high rate of iron deficiency anemia; about a third of the children were affected. There was a wide range of other disorders, from adenoids to heart trouble.

Ordinary medical care simply had not been offered to most of these children in the past. Nearly ninety per cent had not had measles vaccine, for instance, and as many as forty per cent of the children had cavities or poorly formed teeth.

At the end of the first summer, there was practically no follow-up medical treatment provided, according to Dr. Frederick North, senior pediatrician for Head Start. This year improvements have been made but the "data that we have is rather like the care of the poor child, fragmented, discontinuous, and often not too well recorded."

Head Start's research director, Dr. Edmund Gordon of Yeshiva University, estimates that perhaps half the youngsters needing medical treatment were referred to follow-up agencies and that twenty to thirty per cent had their treatment completed.

Dr. North blames the failure on "institutional and bureaucratic inertia, especially in the large cities." He charges that in some cases public health departments "refused to allow their examining doctors to treat even the minor defects discovered, thus creating a need for cumbersome and often unsuccessful referral systems."

In other cases, Dr. North adds, local agencies blamed mothers for "apathy" when investigation would show that few efforts were made to help mothers bring their children to treatment centers. Such simple steps as making convenient appointments for Head Start mothers and providing baby sitters for younger children were often all that was needed, he said.

Dr. Gordon sees "no solution except a national program of health care for these children . . . there's got to be an aggressive program with almost the same kind of insistence on treatment as we demand educationally by compulsory school attendance."

The blame for the spotty health care also lies partly with the Federal anti-poverty agency. It should have moved earlier to strengthen its guidelines to require sound health care follow-up before handing over funds to local agencies.

The same could be said for the educational aspects of the program. But more of the blame lies with local school officials and Congress.

As those first 560,000 Head Start children enter kindergarten and first grade classrooms in the fall of 1966, local school officials also were receiving nearly a billion dollars under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for the schooling of deprived children. But less than seven per cent of it went into programs to continue Head Start-style operations and these rarely maintained Head Start's high standards. And Congress never provided the funds to continue Head Start on a year-round basis through the anti-poverty agency.

Originally it was hoped that half a million children might continue in the year-round programs. This goal was cut to 350,000 the first year (with about half that number actually enrolled) and to 187,000 this year. In Washington, D.C., for instance, 7,561 children attended Head Start classes last summer, but less than ten per cent of that number were enrolled in year-round programs.

Though the lack of follow-through and year-round continuation of Head Start is disturbing, it still does not justify a mood of public depression, nor the conclusion that the hundreds of millions expended for Head Start were wasted.

One major accomplishment of Head Start is that it dramatically cast the spotlight on the importance of the preschool years in a way that no program had done before. It was also the major proving ground for the idea that the poor could be trained to work in the schools as teacher aides. The revolution in the use of mothers and other "amateurs" in a wide variety of subprofessional jobs in the schools today can be traced in large part to Head Start.

Perhaps most importantly, Head Start set new standards for the schools. It demonstrated that concentration of funds and services—resulting in almost double the average per pupil cost—was justified in terms of the gains that could be achieved.

In the long run, Head Start's massive follow-up "failure" may be just the jolt the nation needed to realize the magnitude of the changes that are demanded in the schools in the slums. Head Start remains the biggest lever for change that has ever been tried under the American schoolhouse.

[From American Education magazine, September 1966]

HEAD START OR FALSE START?

(By Charles S. Carleton)

Project Head Start:

Is administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity as part of the War on Poverty.

Is designed to break the cycle of poverty at its most critical point: during a child's formative years.

Has so far touched the lives of 1.3 million disadvantaged children.

Operates two kinds of programs: 1) eight-week long summer programs for four- and five-year-olds who will enter school the following fall; 2) a "full-year" program (lasting anywhere from three to twelve months) for three-, four-, and five-year-olds.

Contains five major components: 1) health services, including medical exams, sight and hearing tests, dental exams, immunizations; 2) nutrition supplementation which includes one and often two full meals a day; 3) education, with emphasis placed on doing, rather than on listening, in classes limited to 15 children with one teacher and two teacher aides; 4) parent involvement as participants in all activities in the centers, on advisory councils, and as paid or volunteer nonprofessional staff members; 5) social services including interviews with parents, recommendation for family counseling services, or referral to public housing authorities, social hygiene departments, or church counseling services.

"Head Start is great," exults a Vermont Head Start teacher. "It gives the kid freedom—a chance to run and jump and get hot. But if after a summer of this he's suddenly thrown into a school system that allows no kind of freedom, where he's told to sit down and shut up and raise his hand and go to the john only at a certain time—well, it's bound to confuse him and make him wonder what school is all about. I think that maybe the biggest thing that can come from Head Start is that our first and second grade education will be liberalized so that children will have more individual freedom. We hope this will be a challenge to the teachers. It certainly is a challenge to the conservative, classical, middleclass concepts of what is right in education."

These candid observations are not unique to the Green Mountain State. They are being echoed across the country as hundreds of thousands of Head Start youngsters pour into regular kindergarten and first-grade classrooms.

There is no doubt that Head Start is working, that for disadvantaged children it means entering regular school better prepared, with greater self-confidence and with a considerably advanced mental capacity compared to children from the same background without Head Start training. (In fact, Benjamin S. Bloom, professor of education at the University of Chicago, says that half of a 17-year-old's mental ability is developed by the time he is four years old—just the age group that Head Start brackets.)

Perhaps the most significant boost that Head Start children are given is their introduction to the world of words. Coming from homes without books, where English is spoken poorly if at all, this vocabulary expansion (both in terms of exposure and actual use) gives them a real jump in their ability to learn through reading and conversation.

But unless Head Start is followed through in the classroom it can be meaningless; or worse, it can be a false start. How? Well, as one Head Start teacher puts it: "It's not that the regular teachers push them back down but, unless the teachers are better than average, they do cut off the gay, inquiring spirit that these kids have been taught. In fact, there were teachers last year who complained they had to have the Head Start kids be quiet while they brought the rest of the children up to their level."

Although having Head Starters get such a jump that they are ahead of their more fortunate peers is unique—and common sense dictates against an eight-week summer program's making up for four or five years of lost ground—Head Starters are set apart in many ways from their peers. A Head Start child's health problems have been taken care of; he is accustomed to receiving breakfast and/or lunch as part of the school day; he is used to a good deal of personal attention

when he needs help, and, as a result, he probably is more easily distracted and less persistent in his activities than other children—more inclined to nonconformism—all traits that indicate a heightening of self-esteem, a growing curiosity, and increasing intellectual development. Additionally, the Head Start child receives more support for his school activities at home than his classmates because of the direct, personal contact with parents that Head Start encourages. As a result of this contact parents are likely to feel that the schools are interested in them and in what they have to say. In exchange, they are more willing to put out some effort on behalf of the schools.

Comments the Vermont teacher: "Of course, the kids have to adjust when they switch from Head Start to school because in a lot of cases they're taking a step backwards. But it's not going to ruin them. Our first grade teachers are slowly coming to appreciate what Head Start is doing. And the kids who can't adjust to the change are the ones who aren't capable of adjusting to anything anyway. Bust most of them can adjust—because kids are smart; they know which way the wind blows. Anyway, we have to make the effort. You know what Eleanor Roosevelt said: 'It's better to light a candle than to curse the darkness.'"

To keep the Head Start candle burning, school systems and Head Start personnel need to work together, exchanging ideas and information, and searching for possible areas of accommodation.

Teachers and administrators should know what is happening in their community Head Start program so they will have a better idea of what kind of children they will be taking into their schools come September. Head Start centers generally welcome visitors to their classes—and certainly should, since the child gains so much from the visit.

Conversely, Head Start personnel should learn just what experiences their children will be having when they go on to school so they can operate the program within a realistic framework. This is not to say that Head Start should be an earlier version of school. In fact, many experts discourage the notion of prepping a child for kindergarten or first grade activities, suggesting that it is not as important for the child to learn to cut, paste, and color as for him to make comfortable with and attracted to the notion that he can create. Similarly, he should get a feeling for music, rather than learn a specific number of songs. In short, Head Start should take positive steps to move the child into school with a healthy, excited attitude about the new experience—and with an awareness of how it will be different from Head Start.

Additionally, the school system should do some soul searching for ways it can improve itself.

What is being done to individualize instruction for each child? The promising ungraded primary system is slowly gaining popularity. Other techniques include expanded use of team teaching, teaching machines, and programmed instruction.

Are changes in teaching style in order? For example, is a greater variety of materials and resources needed? Can a greater number of activities be carried on simultaneously in the classroom?

Is there a large enough staff working with the younger children? Here the use of title I, ESEA funds may offer opportunities for reducing class size or employing nonprofessional teacher aides. Further help may be available by making greater use of volunteers.

How can the interest of parents be maintained and expanded? Can the operation of the PTA be changed to create a more helpful dialogue between the schools and parents? How can the health and nutritional gains of the child be maintained? Other Federal funds such as those available through the Children's Bureau, Special Project Grants,

and the Social Security Act, may be useful in providing continuous health care.

In what ways might the school's and teacher's roles change in working with the total family? To what extent can a school assume social service responsibilities?

Fundamental to all program changes is the matter of teacher acceptance of Head Start. One school system's teachers were dead set against Head Start because they feared that the children would come to class like a horde of miniature Huns, destroying everything in sight because they lacked discipline. As it turned out, these worst fears were not realized; on the contrary, the children, because of their Head Start experience, were ready to take instructions and work placidly with one another.

More important than the attitude the teacher may have about the Head Start program is the teacher's attitude toward the child. Schools and teachers should ask themselves if they are doing their utmost to see the unique opportunities to help the child and increase his optimism for the future. Children feel deeply the expectations of their teachers. If the teacher believes the child is already lost, he probably will be; if the teacher believes he has a bright future, he probably will.

One of the most important—and time consuming—lessons that can be learned from Head Start is how much good can come from the involvement of teachers with parents in an effort to help the child. Says one teacher: "I had a boy in my class who was a real problem. He pushed the other children around, actually attacked them, and just gave me a very rough time. Then I found out that his father beats his mother, and the child lives in mortal terror of it. There are six children in the family, and the father feels trapped and takes it out on beer, babes, and beating mamma. Well I've talked with them and I've worked with the child. But the usual kindergarten teacher can't give a child like that the kind of individual attention he needs. She's by herself and she's got 30 other children to take care of. Head Start made it possible for this boy to come and have a sort of play therapy for four hours a day. I think he'll hang on to some of it. Luckily he's going in with a teacher who understands this kind of problem and may be able to help him."

In Baltimore's large (1,140 children this past summer) Head Start program, many of the possible pitfalls have been avoided through sound organization and accurate foresight. Mrs. Elaine Nolan, director of the program, says that before they got started they were aware that there could be some adjustment problems for the children when they went on to school. So, all of her Head Start teachers are regular teachers taken from the school system's kindergarten classes. "That way," she explains, "we can have the teacher who has worked with the children during the summer teach the class in September."

The Baltimore schools also make use of teacher aides and volunteers so that more individual instruction is possible. "And," says Mrs. Nolan, "we found that by grouping the Head Start children together, the child's adjustment to the school situation has been helped rather than hindered by the summer program. We didn't use teacher aides in the school before Head Start. Our teachers felt they had much more success in this program than in any other they had been a part of. The services available to the children over the summer gave them the advantage of knowing problems in advance."

All over the Nation, Head Start is having its impact—is lighting, and keeping lit, those candles. Approximately 20 percent of the Nation—some 35 million people—live under adverse circumstances. Of these, 17 million are children. As a consequence of Head Start, communities all over America are now

vitaly concerned with the problems of the children of "not-enough." We have developed a national awareness that they can be helped, and that this is the time to do it.

During last year's summer program nearly half of the more than 3,000 counties in the Nation had at least one Head Start center, thereby taking the first vital step in breaking the cycle of poverty, laying a foundation for a lifetime of learning, for better jobs, and often for better health.

The results? Writes a Head Start teacher: "I see more children less tearful, less fearful. I see more smiles, more working together with classmates and adults. I see more verbal expression. The interaction of the child with a helpful adult may be the most important factor in all these gains."

"It is important to realize that these first steps taken by Head Start should not be final steps," says Minnie Berson, Office of Education specialist in early childhood education. "With cooperation and planning, with dedication and understanding, with a willingness to extend the gains of Head Start, our schools can help—and can continue to help—every child of poverty. The child whose future is made brighter by Head Start need not have that light extinguished."

CURTAILING THE FLOW OF UNSOLICITED OBSCENE MAIL

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TUNNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today which would protect the American family from unsolicited obscene mail matter.

The legislation provides that any person receiving unsolicited mail sent to him or a member of his family which is considered obscene, has the right to return it to the Postmaster General and request that the sender be notified to cease sending unsolicited mail to him.

The Postmaster General would then notify the sender of the request and 30 days after the receipt of this notice, the sender must cease his mailing to the addressee. After a second notice, if the unsolicited mail continues, the Postmaster General may request that the Attorney General apply to a Federal district court for a compliance order. Failure to obey the court order would lead to a contempt of court charge.

I believe that the enactment of this legislation is necessary to curtail the volume of unsolicited obscene mail which continues to invade American households.

This legislation would bypass the difficult and complex matter of court interpretation of what contributes obscenity by leaving the decision to each individual American household.

A similar bill passed the House during the 89th Congress but was not considered by the Senate. I hope that the Congress takes speedy action on this legislation.

ANNIVERSARY OF SHARPEVILLE MASSACRE

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my re-

marks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues who have spoken today in observing, with sorrow, the seventh anniversary of the Sharpeville massacre in South Africa.

On March 21, 1960, tens of thousands of Africans demonstrated all over Africa. It was part of a nonviolent campaign against the pass laws which restricted their freedom of movement and employment.

The Sharpeville demonstration was one of a series against apartheid, and there was widespread burning of the passes. At one stage the police fired into a peaceful rally, killing 68 persons, and wounding nearly 200 others. This action shocked the world, and served as a turning point in the United Nation's consideration of the all-important question of what to do about apartheid.

At the time, Mr. Lincoln White, State Department press officer, stated that while the United States could not, as a matter of practice, ordinarily comment on the internal affairs of governments with which it enjoys normal relations, it could not help but regret the tragic loss of life resulting from the measures taken against the demonstrators.

I have very briefly touched on the tragedy of that unhappy day in Sharpeville, but I know that the world will long remember what took place there. We are all more aware of the injustices of apartheid because of Sharpeville, and the need for the elimination of all racial discrimination, no matter where it exists.

POLITICS IN POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, recent news reports indicate that the House Republican policy committee and the Republican leadership are out to "purge" the Post Office Department of politics. Republicans have been just as political, if not more so, in making appointments within the postal service as Democrats. Knowing that my distinguished friends of the Republican Party prefer the reality of facts to the rhetoric of political bombast, I undertook some research on this point. I think the House would find the results edifying.

Since 1961, the number of postmaster positions filled by career employees has never been under 30.6 percent for any single year and the overall record for the past 6 years shows that more than 37 percent of postmaster appointments have been made from the career service.

How does this compare with the record

of the Republican administration from 1953 to 1961? The answer is very, very well, indeed. In the 8 years of Republican rule from 1953 to 1961 a mere 20 percent of postmaster appointments were made from the career ranks.

Also, under Democratic administrations since 1961 career employees have been appointed postmaster in such major cities as New York, Chicago, Baltimore, Galveston, Charlotte, and Columbus, Ohio. In every case, they replaced postmasters who had been appointed from outside the career service.

Taking a broader view, I might also point out that President Johnson has named more career Federal employees to top appointive positions in the executive branch than any President in our Nation's history.

I hope these few facts will help put the picture of the use being made of the experience and abilities of career Federal employees in its proper perspective.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BLACKBURN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HALPERN, for 5 minutes, on March 22, 1967.

Mr. SCHADEBERG, for 10 minutes, on March 22, 1967.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BLACKBURN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BIESTER.

Mr. DELLENBACK.

Mr. FINO.

Mr. BERRY.

Mr. BUTTON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BRASCO) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KEE.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania.

Mr. BROWN of California.

Mr. MURPHY of New York.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.

Mr. HARDY.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. BURLISON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 267. Joint resolution to support emergency food assistance to India; and

H.J. Res. 273. Joint resolution to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to the lease and transfer of tobacco acreage allotments.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 22, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 5424. A bill to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard; with amendment (Rept. No. 146). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 404. Resolution providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 428, joint resolution to support the other American Republics in a historic new phase of the Alliance for Progress (Rept. No. 147). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 366. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction; with amendment (Rept. No. 148). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MATSUNAGA: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 258. Resolution to grant additional travel authority to the Committee on Public Works; with amendment (Rept. No. 149). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 386. Resolution for an investigation in connection with development lending in Africa of those agencies in which the United States participates, and other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 150). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota: H.R. 7521. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to provide additional sources of financing for the rural electrification and rural telephone programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah: H.R. 7522. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing job training programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7523. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUSH: H.R. 7524. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARTER: H.R. 7525. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to permit a widow or widower who remarries after attaining age 60 to receive a widow's or widower's insurance annuity (in a reduced amount) notwithstanding such remarriage; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7526. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the estab-

lishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 7527. A bill to repeal the authority for the current wheat and feed grain programs and to authorize programs that will permit the market system to work more effectively for wheat and feed grains and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 7528. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of business development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7529. A bill to increase the personal income tax exemption of a taxpayer and the additional exemption for his spouse from \$600 to \$1,000, and to increase the exemption for a dependent from \$600 to \$1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 7530. A bill to authorize the establishment of Federal mutual savings banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7531. A bill to insure that public buildings financed with Federal funds are so designed and constructed as to be accessible to the physically handicapped; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 7532. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7533. A bill to incorporate the Paralyzed Veterans of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 7534. A bill to establish a National Institute of Criminal Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7535. A bill to protect the right of privacy by prohibiting wire interception and eavesdropping, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 7536. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct tuition expenses paid by him for the education of his children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 7537. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOUNTAIN:

H.R. 7538. A bill to amend section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 7539. A bill to amend section 1751 of title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for the assassination of the spouse, son, or daughter of the President of the United States and the assassination of the members of the President's Cabinet, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 7540. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act so as to extend and improve the Federal-State program of child-welfare services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 7541. A bill to appropriate funds to carry out section 402 of the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 7542. A bill to increase educational opportunities throughout the Nation by providing grants for the construction of elementary and secondary schools and supplemental educational centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7543. A bill to establish a National

Commission on Older Workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7544. A bill to provide fellowships for graduate study leading to a master's degree or doctor's degree for elementary and secondary school teachers and those who train, guide, or supervise such teachers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7545. A bill to establish the U.S. Academy of Foreign Affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 7546. A bill to prohibit the shipment in commerce of electronic eavesdropping and wiretapping devices; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7547. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to require that in the labeling and advertising of certain drugs sold by prescription the "established name" of such drugs must appear each time the proprietary name is used, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7548. A bill to establish a National Consumer Information Foundation as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7549. A bill to prohibit certain tampering with speedometers on motor vehicles used in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7550. A bill to amend section 212 (a) (14) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to waive the labor certification requirement with respect to nonpreference immigrant aliens from any Communist or Communist-dominated country or area; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7551. A bill to strengthen the criminal penalties for the mailing, importing, or transporting of obscene matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7552. A bill to amend section 312 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to exempt certain additional persons from the requirements as to understanding the English language before their naturalization as citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7553. A bill to amend section 203(a) (2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that parents of lawful resident aliens shall be eligible for second preference immigrant visas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7554. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to increase from 2 to 2½ percent the retirement multiplication factor used in computing annuities of certain employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7555. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 7556. A bill to amend title II of the National Housing Act to provide that a nonprofit organization purchasing housing for use by low-income persons may under certain circumstances obtain an insured mortgage under the regular residential housing program with the full loan-to-value ratio available to an owner-occupant under such program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 7557. A bill to amend section 8(b) (4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, with respect to strike at the sites of construction projects; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 7558. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the

Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 7559. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that medical expenses incurred for the care of certain individuals who are 65 years of age or over may be deducted without regard to the 3-percent and 1-percent floors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 7560. A bill to authorize the disposal of nickel from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 7561. A bill to amend section 10 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, as amended (31 U.S.C. 822a), to provide the General Accounting Office with authority to audit the exchange stabilization fund; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7562. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 7563. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit States, under Federal-State agreements, to provide for coverage for hospital insurance benefits for the aged for certain State and local employees whose services are not otherwise covered by the insurance system established by such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 7564. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the Illinois sesquicentennial; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 7565. A bill to establish a Commission on Government Procurement; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PELL (by request):

H.R. 7566. A bill to provide members of the Colville Confederated Tribes with full citizenship and to provide for vesting each tribal member with his equal cash share representing his equity in all reservation assets of the Colville Confederated Tribes in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 7567. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the definition of compensation for purposes of tax under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 7568. A bill to reduce crime and improve criminal procedures in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TAFT:

H.R. 7569. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 7570. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to provide that the entire cost of health benefits under such act shall be paid by the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 7571. A bill to provide for Federal assistance in the planning and installation of works and measures for the control and prevention of damages resulting from erosion of the roadbeds and rights-of-way of existing State, county, and other rural roads and highways, from erosion of the banks of rivers and streams, and from erosion of unrehabilitated surface or strip-mined,

non-Federal lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 7572. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 7573. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado:

H.R. 7574. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make payments in advance of determination of performance to producers participating in the wheat program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 7575. A bill to designate a portion of the San Francisco-Stockton ship channel as the John F. Baldwin Ship Channel; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KUYKENDALL:

H.R. 7576. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 7577. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to prohibit the mailing of unsolicited sample drug products and other potentially harmful items, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 7578. A bill to amend section 213 of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H.R. 7579. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7580. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7581. A bill to permit certain individuals who are forced to retire at age 60 under Federal law or regulation to continue to pay social security taxes, and receive appropriate benefit credit therefor, until they reach age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7582. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit the payment of full retirement benefits thereunder at age 60 in the case of certain individuals who are forced to retire at that age under Federal law or regulation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H.R. 7583. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards to authorize a fire research and safety program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R. 7584. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the death of Bishop Frederic Baraga; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 7585. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.R. 7586. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide an 8-percent, across-the-board benefit increase, and subsequent increases based on rises in the cost of living; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 7587. A bill to provide for the return of obscene mail matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 7588. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7589. A bill to establish a National Institute of Criminal Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 7590. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to make a separate accounting of funds requested for the Department of Agriculture for programs and activities that primarily stabilize farm income and those that primarily benefit consumers, businessmen, and the general public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 7591. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7592. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from \$600 to \$1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7593. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 7594. A bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 7595. A bill to amend titles III and XI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to strengthen instruction in school health, physical education, and recreation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.J. Res. 456. Joint resolution to support the other American Republics in a historic new phase of the Alliance for Progress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.J. Res. 457. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.J. Res. 458. Joint resolution in honor of Amella Earhart and Joan Merriam Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.J. Res. 459. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.J. Res. 460. Joint resolution requesting the President to instruct the Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations to request the Security Council without delay to convene the Arab States and the State of Israel and other interested nations in a peace conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.J. Res. 461. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the popular election of President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.J. Res. 462. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H.J. Res. 463. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the direct election of the President and the Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESHLEMAN:

H.J. Res. 464. Joint resolution to increase the efficiency of, eliminate political influence with respect to appointments, promotions, assignments, transfers, and designations in the postal field service, to revise the laws governing the appointment of postmasters and rural carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H. Con. Res. 290. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that each future vacancy on the Supreme Court of the United States should be filled with an individual with judicial experience; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. Con. Res. 291. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of committee hearings entitled "Special Inquiry on Invasion of Privacy" and "The Computer and Invasion of Privacy"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. Res. 400. Resolution providing funds for the Committee on Rules; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. Res. 401. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct certain investigations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HORTON:

H. Res. 402. Resolution establishing a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H. Res. 403. Resolution creating a Standing Committee on Standards and Conduct of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ERLENBORN:

H. Res. 405. Resolution to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 2; to the Committee on Government Operations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 7596. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Maggio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7597. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Lo Duca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 7598. A bill for the relief of Jesus L. Lastra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 7599. A bill for the relief of Dr. Emanuel Marcus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 7600. A bill to grant asylum to Svetlana Stalina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 7601. A bill for the relief of Patrick Sibbles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 7602. A bill for the relief of Germain Francols; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 7603. A bill for the relief of Riley C. Melton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:
H.R. 7604. A bill for the relief of Dr. Prinya Tipmongkol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEEDS:
H.R. 7605. A bill for the relief of Miss Margaret Gale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:
H.R. 7606. A bill for the relief of George Koutsovitis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 21, 1967

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, new every morning is the love our waking and uprising prove. Our fathers trusted in Thee and were not confounded—in Thee we trust. In Thee is our sure confidence that the way of the Republic is down no fatal slope but up to freer sun and air. We thank Thee for friendship and fellowship, for the joy of service, and the challenge of great causes.

In this day of destiny for us, and for the world, make us worthy of our high calling as keepers of the sacred flame.

Guide the thoughts and aspirations of Thy servants here, that in the deliberations of this day they may ordain for the governance of our Nation only such things as shall please Thee, to the glory of Thy name and the safety, honor, and welfare of our people.

In the midst of all that saddens and perplexes in this difficult, yet splendid day, give us an inner radiance, not knowing that our faces shine, but humbly glad that in a world that lieth in darkness we are the children of the light.

In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 20, 1967, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT (H. DOC. NO. 89)

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 16, 1967, the Secretary of the Senate, on March 17, 1967, received two messages from the President of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States on the Communications Satellite Act. Without objection, the message will be printed in the RECORD, without being read, and appropriately referred.

The message was referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:
Accomplishments of the past year under the Communications Satellite Act of

1962 have brought mankind to the threshold of a full-time global communications service to which all nations of the world may have equal access, from which all nations of the world may derive their share of the benefits.

Our space technology is opening new doorways to world peace. Within the grasp of the world's peoples is the potential for completely new, heretofore unimagined ways of peaceful cooperation for expanding world trade, for enhancing educational opportunities, for uplifting the spirit and enriching the lives of people everywhere.

Fifty-five nations of the world have joined the Intelsat consortium and pledged their collective efforts toward establishing a single, global communications system which can advance the social, political, cultural, and economic interests of all.

Our Nation has stated in the past and it reaffirms its policy of making available as promptly as possible the vast benefits of this new technology to its own people and to the people of all nations.

This policy is deeply rooted in the belief that nations can come closer together and world peace can be obtained if all the peoples of the world are given the opportunity for understanding the interests, the problems, the cultures, and the aspirations of one another.

We will continue in full partnership with our international neighbors to seek an environment in which all nations—in particular the developing nations of the world—can obtain high-quality communications with all others.

There has been consistent effort and effective progress at all levels of our Federal agencies, and of our committees in Congress on behalf of achieving the aims of the Communications Satellite Act. Under section 404(a) of the act, I am transmitting to Congress a report of this progress.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 17, 1967.

THE QUALITY OF AMERICAN GOVERNMENT (H. DOC. NO. 90)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, concerning the quality of American government. Without objection, the message will be printed in the RECORD, without being read, and will be appropriately referred.

The message from the President was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

THE BACKGROUND

History will say this of America, that it established a community of freedom and order, preserved and perfected the concept of democracy, and enriched the lives of its citizens, all under a rule of law.

The law is our instrument for developing our society along that vision of government which was the dream of our fathers and is the hope of our sons.

It is only part of the total instrument, however. The rest of that instrument is the institutional machinery which enables law to work in response to the will

of the Congress and the people. It is a condition of any law that its effectiveness must be judged by its administration.

The machinery of our Government has served us well. It has been the vehicle of the greatest progress and prosperity any nation has ever achieved.

But this record should give us no cause for complacency. For any realistic review today reveals that there are substantial improvements to be made.

Further reorganization of the executive branch would make possible more effective government;

Administration of programs which are the joint responsibility of Federal, State, and local governments should be strengthened;

At every level of government, steps must be taken to assure a steady flow of qualified, and trained managers, and administrators for the years ahead;

We must pursue our efforts to expand the modern techniques which already are at work to reduce costs and improve the efficiency of government.

GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION

Government's relative simplicity did not demand many major reforms in administrative machinery until this century, with the great changes it brought to our society. Then Presidents beginning with Theodore Roosevelt began finding and reporting to the Congress obsolescence which hampered the efficient execution of the Nation's policies.

In 1937, Franklin Roosevelt and the 75th Congress were still harnessing the resources of Government to continue the rout of the great depression which had threatened to overwhelm the country. President Roosevelt submitted to the Congress a recommendation for reorganization legislation with these words:

A government without good management is a house build on sand.

Little more than a decade later, under President Truman's administration, a distinguished Commission headed by former President Herbert Hoover looked deeply into the need for reorganization and sounded the same warning:

The highest aims and ideals of democracy can be thwarted through excessive administrative costs and through waste, disunity, irresponsibility, and other byproducts of inefficient government.

Since those words were spoken, the machinery of American Government has undergone many changes.

Two major ones have been accomplished in this administration:

In 1965, the 89th Congress established the Department of Housing and Urban Development, which brought the hope of renewed life for our cities.

In 1966, the same Congress provided the mechanism for straightening out our transportation lifeline by establishing the Department of Transportation.

In addition, in the same 2-year period we have completed 10 additional reorganizations to consolidate programs and strengthen functions. I have submitted two new reorganization plans so far this year.

We have not reached the end of the reorganizations which are required if we are to adapt our Government structure to the changes which have been taking